THE WORLD'S FAMOUS ORATIONS

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

The World's Famous Orations

VOL. X

AMERICA—III

1861—1905

THE WORLD'S FAMOUS ORATIONS

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

FRANCIS W. HALSEY
ASSOCIATE EDITOR

IN TEN VOLUMES

Vol. X
AMERICA—III

FUNK *and* WAGNALLS COMPANY
New York and London

COPYRIGHT, 1906, BY
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
[*Printed in the United States of America*]
Published December, 1906

CONTENTS

VOL. X—AMERICA—III (1861-1905)

	Page
EDWARD D. BAKER—His Reply to Breckenridge (1861)	3
BEECHER—His Speech in Liverpool (1863)	9
CARL SCHURZ—A Plea for General Amnesty (1872)	27
GREELEY—During His Campaign for President (1872)	54
SUSAN B. ANTHONY—On Woman's Right to the Suffrage (1873)	58
LAMAR—On Sumner and the South (1874)	61
CURTIS—His Oration at Concord (1875)	65
INGERSOLL—I His Speech Nominating Blaine for President (1876)	77
II At His Brother's Grave (1879)	81
MOODY—What Think Ye of Christ?	84
CONKLING—His Speech Nominating Grant for a Third Term (1880)	94
GARFIELD—His Speech Nominating Sherman for President (1880)	99
GRANT—Reasons for Being a Republican (1880)	107
BLAINE—On the Death of Garfield (1882)	111

CONTENTS

Page

CLEVELAND—I His First Inaugural Address (1885) 130
II His Eulogy of McKinley (1901) . . . 137
GRADY—The Old South and the New (1886) . 141
HARRISON—His Inaugural Address (1889) . . 155
MISS WILLARD—Work Done for Humanity (1890) 162
BLAND—The Parting of the Ways (1893) . 165
REED—In Closing the Wilson Tariff Bill Debate (1894) 175
CRISP—In Closing the Wilson Tariff Bill Debate (1894) 186
SHERMAN—On "the Crime of 1873" (1895) . 198
ALTGELD—On Municipal and Governmental Ownership (1897) 208
HOAR—Subjugation of the Philippines Iniquitous (1902) 220
HAY—His Tribute to McKinley (1902) . . . 228
MCKINLEY—His Last Speech (1902) . . . 239
ROOSEVELT—I His Inaugural Address (1905) . 249
II On American Motherhood (1905) . . 253
INDEX TO THE TEN VOLUMES 263

VOL. X

AMERICA—III

1861—1905

EDWARD D. BAKER

HIS REPLY TO BRECKENRIDGE[1]

(1861)

Born in London in 1811, died in 1861; came to America in 1816; elected to Congress from Illinois in 1845; Colonel and Brigade Commander in the Mexican War, 1847–48; again elected to Congress from Illinois in 1849; removing to Oregon, elected a United States Senator in 1860; raised a regiment in New York and Philadelphia in 1861; commanded a brigade at the Battle of Ball's Bluff on October 21, 1861; killed at Ball's Bluff while leading a desperate charge.

THE senator from Kentucky stands up here in a manly way in opposition to what he sees is the overwhelming sentiment of the Senate, and utters reproof, malediction, and prediction combined. Well, sir, it is not every prediction that is prophecy. It is the easiest thing in the world to do; there is nothing easier, except to be mistaken when we have predicted. I confess, Mr. President, that I would not have predicted

[1] From a speech in the United States Senate on August 1, 1861, eleven days after the Battle of Bull Run. Breckenridge was then a senator from Kentucky and had been defeated as the candidate of the Southern Democrats for the presidency in the election of November, 1860. On being expelled from the Senate, December 4, 1861, he entered the Confederate army, where he served as a major-general and finally as secretary of war.

Baker's speech is remembered as one of the most dramatic ever delivered in the United States Senate. Breckenridge, whose speech, strongly Southern in tone, had provoked it, was already on his feet when Baker, a colonel in the army as well as a senator, alternating in his services between his seat in the Senate and his

three weeks ago the disasters[1] which have overtaken our arms; and I do not think (if I were to predict now) that six months hence the senator will indulge in the same tone of prediction which is his favorite key now. I would ask him what would you have us do now—a Confederate army within twenty miles[2] of us, advancing, or threatening to advance, to overwhelm your government; to shake the pillars of the Union; to bring it around your head in ruins if you stay here?

Are we to stop and talk about an uprising sentiment in the North against the war? Are we to predict evil, and retire from what we predict? Is it not the manly part to go on as we have begun, to raise money, and levy armies, to organize them, to prepare to advance; when we

tent in the field, entered the Senate-chamber at the eastern door, wearing his blue army coat and fatigue cap, a riding whip in his hand and his sword in its scabbard. Blaine, in his "Twenty Years of Congress," describes how Baker "laid his sword upon his desk" and sat down, listening to Breckenridge. When Breckenridge had finished, Baker, "his face aglow with excitement, sprang to the floor. No more thrilling speech was ever delivered. The striking appearance of the speaker in the uniform of a soldier, his superb voice, his graceful manner, all united to give the occasion an extraordinary interest." Eleven weeks later Baker lay dead on the field of Ball's Bluff.

[1] In the first battle of Bull Run the Federals lost 481 killed, 1,011 wounded, and 1,421 missing; the Confederates, 387 killed and 1,582 missing. The Federals, put to rout, also lost 28 guns and 5,000 small arms.

[2] The field of Bull Run is twenty-five miles southwest of Washington.

do advance, to regulate that advance by all the laws and regulations that civilization and humanity will allow in time of battle? Can we do anything more? To talk to us about stopping is idle; we will never stop. Will the senator yield to rebellion? Will he shrink from armed insurrection? Will his State justify it? Will its better public opinion allow it? Shall we send a flag of truce? What would he have? Or would he conduct this war so feebly, that the whole world would smile at us in derision? What would he have?

These speeches of his, sown broadcast over the land, what clear distinct meaning have they? Are they not intended for disorganization in our very midst? Are they not intended to dull our weapons? Are they not intended to destroy our zeal? Are they not intended to animate our enemies? Sir, are they not words of brilliant, polished treason?

What would have been thought if, in another capitol, in another republic, in a yet more martial age, a senator as grave, not more eloquent or dignified than the senator from Kentucky, yet with the Roman purple flowing over his shoulders, had risen in his place, surrounded by all the illustrations of Roman glory, and declared that advancing Hannibal was just, and that Carthage ought to be dealt with in terms of peace? What would have been thought if, after the Battle of Cannæ, a senator there had risen in his place and denounced every levy of

the Roman people, every expenditure of its treasure, and every appeal to the old recollections and the old glories? Sir, a senator, himself learned far more than myself in such lore [Mr. Fessenden[1]], tells me, in a voice that I am glad is audible, that he would have been hurled from the Tarpeian rock.

When we subjugate South Carolina, what shall we do? We shall compel its obedience to the Constitution of the United States; that is all. Why play upon words? We do not mean, we never have said, any more. If it be slavery that men should obey the Constitution their fathers fought for, let it be so. If it be freedom, it is freedom equally for them and for us. We propose to subjugate rebellion into loyalty; we propose to subjugate insurrection into peace; we propose to subjugate Confederate anarchy into constitutional Union liberty. The senator well knows that we propose no more. I ask him—I appeal to his better judgment now—what does he imagine we intend to do, if fortunately we conquer Tennessee or South Carolina—call it "conquer," if you will, sir—what do we propose to do?

[1] Blaine relates that Breckenridge understood this suggestion to come from Sumner instead of Fessenden, and in his reply to Baker bitterly denounced Sumner, who looked surprised, but having become accustomed to abuse from the South, said nothing. When next day it was shown by the *Globe* that Mr. Fessenden was the offender, Mr. Breckenridge neither "apologized to Mr. Sumner nor attacked the senator from Maine."

They will have their courts still; they will have their ballot-boxes still; they will have their elections still; they will have their representatives upon this floor still; they will have taxation and representation still; they will have the writ of *habeas corpus* still; they will have every privilege they ever had and all we desire. When the Confederate armies are scattered; when their leaders are banished from power; when the people return to a late repentant sense of the wrong they have done to a government they never felt but in benignancy and blessing,—then the Constitution made for all will be felt by all, like the descending rains from heaven which bless all alike. Is that subjugation? To restore what was, as it was, for the benefit of the whole country and of the whole human race, is all we desire and all we can have.

Sir, how can we retreat? Sir, how can we make peace? Who shall treat? What commissioners? Who would go? Upon what terms? Where is to be your boundary line? Where the end of the principles we shall have to give up? What will become of constitutional government? What will become of public liberty? What of past glories? What of future hopes? Shall we sink into the insignificance of the grave—a degraded, defeated, emasculated people, frightened by the results of one battle, and scared at the visions raised by the imagination of the senator from Kentucky upon this floor? No, sir; a thousand times no, sir! We will rally

—if, indeed, our words be necessary—we will rally the people, the loyal people, of the whole country. They will pour forth their treasure, their money, their men, without stint, without measure. The most peaceable man in this body may stamp his foot upon this Senate-chamber floor, as of old a warrior and a senator did, and from that single stamp there will spring forth armed legions.

Shall one battle determine the fate of an empire? or the loss of one thousand men, or twenty thousand; or one hundred million dollars, or five hundred million dollars? In a year's peace, in ten years, at most, of peaceful progress, we can restore them all. There will be some graves reeking with blood, watered by the tears of affection. There will be some privation; there will be some loss of luxury; there will be somewhat more need for labor to procure the necessaries of life. When that is said, all is said. If we have the country, the whole country, the Union, the Constitution, free government—with these there will return all the blessings of well-ordered civilization; the path of the country will be a career of greatness and of glory such as, in the olden time, our fathers saw in the dim visions of years yet to come, and such as would have been ours now, to-day, if it had not been for the treason for which the senator too often seeks to apologize!

BEECHER

HIS SPEECH IN LIVERPOOL[1]

(1863)

Born in 1813, died in 1887; Pastor of churches in Indiana in 1837–47, and of Plymouth Church in Brooklyn in 1847–87; Founder and Editor of *The Christian Union* in 1870–81; one of the most prominent of antislavery orators; made notable speeches in England during the American Civil War.

For more than twenty-five years I have been made perfectly familiar with popular assemblies in all parts of my country except the extreme south. There has not for the whole of that time been a single day of my life when it would have been safe for me to go south of Mason and Dixon's line in my own country, and all for one reason: my solemn, earnest, persistent testimony against that which I consider to be the most atrocious thing under the sun—the system of American slavery in a great, free republic. [Cheers.] I have passed through that early period when right of free speech was denied to me. Again and again I have attempted to address audiences that, for no other crime than that of free speech, visited me with all manner of contumelious epithets;

[1] Delivered in Liverpool on October 16, 1863, when his audience became repeatedly little more than a shouting mob, tempered by periodical exhaustion, so strong were its sympathies with the Southern cause. Abridged.

and now since I have been in England, altho I have met with greater kindness and courtesy on the part of most than I deserved, yet, on the other hand, I perceive that the Southern influence prevails to some extent in England. [Applause and uproar.] It is my old acquaintance; I understand it perfectly—[laughter]—and I have always held it to be an unfailing truth that where a man had a cause that would bear examination he was perfectly willing to have it spoken about. [Applause.] Therefore, when I saw so much nervous apprehension that, if I were permitted to speak—[hisses and applause]—when I found they were afraid to have me speak—[hisses, laughter, and "No, no!"]—when I found that they considered my speaking damaging to their cause—[applause]—when I found that they appealed from facts and reasonings to mob law—[applause and uproar]—I said. No man need tell me what the heart and secret counsel of these men are. They tremble and are afraid. [Applause, laughter, hisses, "No, no!" and a voice, "New York mob."]

Now, personally, it is a matter of very little consequence to me whether I speak here to-night or not. [Laughter and cheers.] But one thing is very certain—if you do permit me to speak here to-night you will hear very plain talking. [Applause and hisses.] You will not find a man,—you will not find me to be a man that dared to speak about Great Britain three thousand miles off, and then is afraid to speak to Great

Britain when he stands on her shores. [Immense applause and hisses.] And if I do not mistake the tone and the temper of Englishmen, they had rather have a man who opposes them in a manly way—[applause from all parts of the hall]—than a sneak that agrees with them in an unmanly way. [Applause and "Bravo!"] If I can carry you with me by sound convictions, I shall be immensely glad; but if I can not carry you with me by facts and sound arguments, I do not wish you to go with me at all; and all that I ask is simply *fair play*. [Applause and a voice, "You shall have it, too."] Those of you who are kind enough to wish to favor my speaking—and you will observe that my voice is slightly husky, from having spoken almost every night in succession for some time past—those who wish to hear me will do me the kindness simply to sit still and to keep still; and I and my friends the Secessionists will make all the noise. [Laughter.]

There are two dominant races in modern history: the Germanic and the Romanic races. The Germanic races tend to personal liberty, to a sturdy individualism, to civil and to political liberty. The Romanic race tends to absolutism in government; it is clannish; it loves chieftains; it develops a people that crave strong and showy governments to support and plan for them. The Anglo-Saxon race belongs to the great German family, and is a fair exponent of its peculiarities. The Anglo-Saxon carries self-government and self-development with him wherever he goes. He

has popular GOVERNMENT and popular INDUSTRY; for the effects of a generous civil liberty are not seen a whit more plainly in the good order, in the intelligence, and in the virtue of a self-governing people, than in their amazing enterprise and the scope and power of their creative industry. The power to create riches is just as much a part of the Anglo-Saxon virtues as the power to create good order and social safety. The things required for prosperous labor, prosperous manufactures, and prosperous commerce are three: first, liberty; secondly, liberty; thirdly, liberty—but these are not merely the same liberty, as I shall show you.

First, there must be liberty to follow those laws of business which experience has developed, without imposts or restrictions, or governmental intrusions. Business simply wants to be let alone. ["Hear, hear!"]

Then, secondly, there must be liberty to distribute and exchange products of industry in any market without burdensome tariffs, without imposts, and without vexatious regulations. There must be these two liberties—liberty to create wealth, as the makers of it think best according to the light and experience which business has given them; and then liberty to distribute what they have created without unnecessary vexatious burdens. The comprehensive law of the ideal industrial condition of the world is free manufacture and free trade. ["Hear, hear!" A voice, "The Murrill tariff."]

I have said there were three elements of liberty. The third is the necessity of an intelligent and free race of customers. There must be freedom among producers; there must be freedom among the distributers; there must be freedom among the customers. It may not have occurred to you that it makes any difference what one's customers are; but it does, in all regular and prolonged business. The condition of the customer determines how much he will buy, determines of what sort he will buy. Poor and ignorant people buy little and that of the poorest kind. The richest and the intelligent, having the more means to buy, buy the most, and always buy the best.

Here, then, are the three liberties: liberty of the producer, liberty of the distributer, and liberty of the consumer. The first two need no discussion—they have been long, thoroughly, and brilliantly illustrated by the political economists of Great Britain, and by her eminent statesmen; but it seems to me that enough attention has not been directed to the third, and, with your patience, I will dwell on that for a moment, before proceeding to other topics.

It is a necessity of every manufacturing and commercial people that their customers should be very wealthy and intelligent. Let us put the subject before you in the familiar light of your own local experience. To whom do the tradesmen of Liverpool sell the most goods at the highest profit? To the ignorant and poor, or to

the educated and prosperous? [A voice, "To the Southerner." Laughter.] The poor man buys simply for his body; he buys food, he buys clothing, he buys fuel, he buys lodging. His rule is to buy the least and the cheapest that he can. He goes to the store as seldom as he can,—he brings away as little as he can—[much laughter] —and he buys for the least he can. Poverty is not a misfortune to the poor only who suffer it, but it is more or less a misfortune to all with whom they deal.

On the other hand, a man well off—how is it with him? He buys in far greater quantity. He can afford to do it; he has the money to pay for it. He buys in far greater variety, because he seeks to gratify not merely physical wants, but also mental wants. He buy for the satisfaction of sentiment and taste, as well as of sense. He buys silk, wool, flax, cotton; he buys all metals—iron, silver, gold, platinum; in short he buys for all necessities and of all substances. But that is not all. He buys a better quality of goods. He buys richer silks, finer cottons, higher grained wools. Now, a rich silk means so much skill and care of somebody's that has been expended upon it to make it finer and richer; and so of cotton, and so of wool. That is, the price of the finer goods runs back to the very beginning, and remunerates the workman as well as the merchant. Indeed, the whole laboring community is as much interested and profited as the mere merchant, in this buying and selling of the

higher grades in the greater varieties and quantities.

The law of price is the skill; and the amount of skill expended in the work is as much for the market as are the goods. A man comes to the market and says, "I have a pair of hands"; and he obtains the lowest wages. Another man comes and says, "I have something more than a pair of hands—I have truth and fidelity"; he gets a higher price. Another man comes and says, "I have something more; I have hands and strength, and fidelity, and skill." He gets more than either of the others. The next man comes and says, "I have got hands and strength, and skill, and fidelity; but my hands work more than that. They know how to create things for the fancy, for the affections, for the moral sentiments"; and he gets more than any of the others. The last man comes and says, "I have all these qualities, and have them so highly that it is a peculiar genius"; and genius carries the whole market and gets the highest price. [Loud applause.] So that both the workman and the merchant are profited by having purchasers that demand quality, variety, and quantity.

Now, if this be so in the town or the city, it can only be so because it is a law. This is the specific development of a general or universal law, and therefore we should expect to find it as true of a nation as of a city like Liverpool. I know it is so, and you know that it is true of all the world; and it is just as important to have

customers educated, intelligent, moral, and rich, out of Liverpool as it is in Liverpool. [Applause.] They are able to buy; they want variety, they want the very best; and those are the customers you want. That nation is the best customer that is freest, because freedom works prosperity, industry, and wealth. Great Britain, then, aside from moral considerations, has a direct commercial and pecuniary interest in the liberty, civilization, and wealth of every people and every nation on the globe. [Loud applause.]

You have also an interest in this, because you are a moral and a religious people. ["Oh, oh!" Laughter and applause.] You desire it from the highest motives, and godliness is profitable in all things, having the promise of the life that is, as well as of that which is to come; but if there were no hereafter, and if man had no progress in this life, and if there were no question of moral growth at all, it would be worth your while to protect civilization and liberty, merely as a commercial speculation. To evangelize has more than a moral and religious import—it comes back to temporal relations. Wherever a nation that is crushed, cramped, degraded under despotism, is struggling to be free, you, Leeds, Sheffield, Manchester, Paisley, all have an interest that that nation should be free. When depressed and backward people demand that they may have a chance to rise—Hungary, Italy, Poland—it is a duty for humanity's sake, it is a duty for the highest moral motives, to

sympathize with them; but besides all these there is a material and an interested reason why you should sympathize with them. Pounds and pence join with conscience and with honor in this design.

Now, Great Britain's chief want is—what? They have said that your chief want is cotton. I deny it. Your chief want is consumers. [Applause and hisses.] You have got skill, you have got capital, and you have got machinery enough to manufacture goods for the whole population of the globe. You could turn out fourfold as much as you do, if you only had the market to sell in. It is not therefore so much the want of fabric, tho there may be a temporary obstruction of that; but the principal and increasing want—increasing from year to year—is, where shall we find men to buy what we can manufacture so fast? [Interruption over a voice, "The Murrill tariff." Applause.]

There is in this a great and sound principle of political economy. If the South should be rendered independent——[1]

Well, you have had your turn; now let me have mine again. [Loud applause and laughter.] It is a little inconvenient to talk against the wind; but, after all, if you will just keep good-

[1] At this point mingled cheering and hisses interrupted the speaker until "half the audience rose to their feet, waving hats and handkerchiefs, and in every part of the hall there was the greatest commotion and uproar." Mr. Beecher "quietly and smilingly waited until quiet was restored, and then proceeded."

natured—I am not going to lose my temper; will you watch yours? Besides all that, it rests me, and gives me a chance, you know, to get my breath. [Applause and hisses.] And I think that the bark of those men is worse than their bite. They do not mean any harm; they do not know any better. [Loud applause, hisses and continued uproar.]

What will be the result if this present struggle shall eventuate in the separation of America, and making the South—[loud applause, hooting and cries of "Bravo!"]—a slave territory exclusively—[cries of "No, no!" and laughter]—and the North a free territory; what will be the first result? You will lay the foundation for carrying the slave population clear through to the Pacific Ocean. That is the first step. There is not a man who has been a leader of the South any time within these twenty years, that has not had this for a plan. It was for this that Texas was invaded, first by colonists, next by marauders, until it was wrested from Mexico. It was for this that they engaged in the Mexican War itself, by which the vast territory reaching to the Pacific was added to the Union. Never have they for a moment given up the plan of spreading the American institution, as they call it, straight through toward the West, until the slave who has washed his feet in the Atlantic shall be carried to wash them in the Pacific. [Cries of "Question" and uproar.] There! I have got

that statement out, and you can not put it back. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, let us consider the prospect. If the South become a slave empire, what relation will it have to you as a customer? [A voice, "Or any other man." Laughter.] It would be an empire of twelve millions of people. Of these, eight millions are white and four millions black. [A voice, "How many have you got?"] Consider that one-third of the whole are the miserably poor, unbuying blacks. You do not manufacture much for them. You have not got machinery coarse enough. [Laughter and "No."] Your labor is too skilled by far to manufacture bagging and linsey-woolsey. [A Southerner, "We are going to free them every one."] Then you and I agree exactly. One other third consists of a poor, unskilled, degraded white population; and the remainder one-third, which is a large allowance, we will say, intelligent and rich. Now here are twelve millions of people, and only one-third of them are customers that can afford to buy the kind of goods that you bring to market. [Interruption and uproar.]

My friends, I saw a man once, who was a little late at a railway station, chase an express train. He did not catch it. If you are going to stop this meeting, you have got to stop it before I speak; for after I have got the things out, you may chase as long as you please—you will not catch them. But there is luck in leisure; I'm going to take it easy. Two-thirds of the popula-

tion of the Southern States to-day are non-purchasers of English goods. You must recollect another fact—namely, that this is going on clear through to the Pacific Ocean; and if by sympathy or help you establish a slave empire, you sagacious Britons—if you like it better, then, I will leave the adjective out—are busy in favoring the establishment of an empire from ocean to ocean that should have fewest customers and the largest non-buying population. ["No, no!" A voice, "I thought it was a happy people that population parted."]

Now, for instance, just look at this—the difference between free labor and slave labor to produce cultivated land. The State of Virginia has 15,000 more square miles of land than the State of New York; but Virginia has only 15,000 square miles improved, while New York has 20,000 square miles improved. Of unimproved land Virginia has about 23,000 square miles, and New York only about 10,000 square miles. These facts speak volumes as to the capacity of the territory to bear population. The smaller is the quantity of soil uncultivated, the greater is the density of the population; and upon that their value as customers depends. Let us take the States of Maryland and Massachusetts. Maryland has 2,000 more square miles of land than Massachusetts; but Maryland has about 4,000 square miles of land improved, Massachusetts has 3,200 square miles. Maryland has 2,800 unimproved square miles of land, while Massachu-

setts has but 1,800 square miles unimproved. But these two are little States,—let us take greater States: Pennsylvania and Georgia. The State of Georgia has 12,000 more square miles of land than Pennsylvania. Georgia has only about 9,800 square miles of improved land; Pennsylvania has 13,400 square miles of improved land, or about 2,300,000 acres more than Georgia. Georgia has about 25,600 square miles of unimproved land, and Pennsylvania has only 10,400 square miles, or about 10,000,000 acres less of *un*improved land than Georgia. The one is a slave State and the other is a free State. I do not want you to forget such statistics as those, having once heard them.

Now, what can England make for the poor white population of such a future empire, and for her slave population? What carpets, what linens, what cottons can you sell to them? What machines, what looking-glasses, what combs, what leather, what books, what pictures, what engravings? [A voice, "We'll sell them ships."] You may sell ships to a few, but what ships can you sell to two-thirds of the population of poor whites and blacks? A little bagging and a little linsey-woolsey, a few whips and manacles, are all that you can sell for the slave. [Great applause and uproar.] This very day, in the slave States of America there are eight millions out of twelve millions that are not, and can not be your customers from the very laws of trade.

Do you sympathize with the minority in Rome or the majority in Italy? [A voice, "With Italy."] To-day the South is the minority in America, and they are fighting for *independence!* For what? [Uproar. A voice, "Three cheers for independence!" Hisses.] I could wish so much bravery had a better cause, and that so much self-denial had been less deluded; that the poisonous and venomous doctrine of State rights might have been kept aloof; that so many gallant spirits, such as Jackson, might still have lived. [Great applause and loud cheers, again and again renewed.] The force of these facts, historical and incontrovertible, can not be broken, except by diverting attention by an attack upon the North. It is said that the North is fighting for the Union, and not for emancipation. The North is fighting for the Union, for that ensures emancipation. [Loud cheers, "Oh, oh!" "No, no!" and cheers.]

A great many men say to ministers of the Gospel: "You pretend to be preaching and working for the love of the people. Why, you are all the time preaching for the sake of the Church." What does the minister say? "It is by means of the Church that we help the people," and when men say that we are fighting for the Union, I, too, say that we are fighting for the Union. ["Hear, hear!" and a voice, "That's right."] But the motive determines the value; and why are we fighting for the Union? Because we never shall forget the testimony of our

enemies. They have gone off declaring that the Union in the hands of the North was fatal to slavery. [Loud applause.] There is testimony in court for you. [A voice, "See that!" and laughter.]

In the first place I am ashamed to confess that such was the thoughtlessness—[interruption]—such was the stupor of the North—[renewed interruption]—you will get a word at a time; to-morrow will let folks see what it is you do not want to hear—that for a period of twenty-five years she went to sleep, and permitted herself to be drugged and poisoned with the Southern prejudice against black men. [Applause and uproar.]

Now as to those States that had passed "black" laws, as we call them; they are filled with Southern emigrants. The southern parts of Ohio, the southern part of Indiana, where I myself lived for years, and which I knew like a book, the southern part of Illinois, where Mr. Lincoln lives—[great uproar]—these parts are largely settled by emigrants from Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Virginia, and North Carolina, and it was their vote, or the Northern votes pandering for political reasons to theirs, that passed in those States the infamous "black" laws; and the Republicans in these States have a record, clean and white, as having opposed these laws in every instance as "infamous." Now as to the State of New York; it is asked whether a negro is not obliged to have a certain

freehold property, or a certain amount of property, before he can vote. It is so still in North Carolina and Rhode Island for *white* folks—it is so in New York State. [Mr. Beecher's voice slightly failed him here, and he was interrupted by a person who tried to imitate him. Cries of "Shame!" and "Turn him out!"]

No man can unveil the future; no man can tell what revolutions are about to break upon the world; no man can tell what destiny belongs to France, nor to any of the European powers; but one thing is certain, that in the exigencies of the future there will be combinations and recombinations, and that those nations that are of the same faith, the same blood, and the same substantial interests, ought not to be alienated from each other, but ought to stand together. [Immense cheering and hisses.] I do not say that you ought not to be in the most friendly alliance with France or with Germany; but I do say that your own children, the offspring of England, ought to be nearer to you than any people of strange tongue. [A voice, "Degenerate sons," applause and hisses; another voice, "What about the *Trent?*"] If there had been any feelings of bitterness in America, let me tell you that they had been excited, rightly or wrongly, under the impression that Great Britain was going to intervene between us and our own lawful struggle. [A voice, "No!" and applause.] With the evidence that there is no such intention all bitter feelings will pass away. [Applause.]

We do not agree with the recent doctrine of neutrality as a question of law. But it is past, and we are not disposed to raise that question. We accept it now as a fact, and we say that the utterance of Lord Russell at Blairgowrie—[applause, hisses, and a voice, "What about Lord Brougham?"]—together with the declaration of the government in stopping war-steamers here—[great uproar and applause]—have gone far toward quieting every fear and removing every apprehension from our minds. [Uproar and shouts of applause.] And now in the future it is the work of every good man and patriot not to create divisions, but to do the things that will make for peace. ["Oh, oh!" and laughter.] On our part it shall be done. [Applause and hisses, and "No, no!"]

On your part it ought to be done; and when in any of the convulsions that come upon the world, Great Britain finds herself struggling single-handed against the gigantic powers that spread oppression and darkness—[applause, hisses, and uproar]—there ought to be such cordiality that she can turn and say to her first-born and most illustrious child, "Come!" ["Hear, hear!" Applause, tremendous cheers, and uproar.] I will not say that England can not again, as hitherto, single-handed manage any power—[applause and uproar]—but I will say that England and America together for religion and liberty—[a voice, "Soap, soap," uproar, and great applause]—are a match for the world.

[Applause; a voice, "They don't want any more soft soap."] Now, gentlemen and ladies—[a voice, "Sam Slick"; and another voice, "Ladies and gentlemen, if you please!"]—when I came I was asked whether I would answer questions, and I very readily consented to do so, as I had in other places; but I will tell you it was because I expected to have the opportunity of speaking with some sort of ease and quiet. [A voice, "So you have."]

I have for an hour and a half spoken against a storm—["Hear, hear!"]—and you yourselves are witnesses that, by the interruption, I have been obliged to strive with my voice, so that I no longer have the power to control this assembly. [Applause.] And altho I am in spirit perfectly willing to answer any question, and more than glad of the chance, yet I am by this very unnecessary opposition to-night incapacitated physically from doing it. Ladies and gentlemen, I bid you good evening.[1]

[1] When Beecher had taken his seat there came another outburst of prolonged cheers mingled with hisses, groans and catcalls. From the gallery some one proposed three cheers for the lecturer, which were given with enthusiasm. A vote of thanks being then proposed. it was carried with prolonged cheers and waving of hats and handkerchiefs. Beecher afterward said of this experience "I got control of the meeting in an hour and a half, and then I had a clear road the rest of the way. But it required a three hours' use of my voice at its utmost strength."

CARL SCHURZ

A PLEA FOR GENERAL AMNESTY[1]

(1872)

Born in 1829, died in 1906; took part in an uprising in the Palatinate in 1849 and was arrested, but escaped to Switzerland; came to the United States in 1852; made Minister to Spain in 1861, but resigned to enter the Union army, where he became a Major-General; elected Senator from Missouri in 1869; a leader in the Liberal Republican movement of 1872; Secretary of the Interior in 1877; prominent in the "Mugwump" movement of 1884.

In the course of this debate we have listened to some senators, as they conjured up before our eyes once more all the horrors of the Rebellion, the wickedness of its conception, how terrible its incidents were, and how harrowing its consequences. Sir, I admit it all; I will not combat the correctness of the picture; and yet if I differ from the gentlemen who drew it, it is because,

[1] From a speech delivered in the United States Senate, January 30, 1872, as reported in *The Congressional Globe*. The subject of debate was a bill which provided that no person should be a senator, representative, or presidential elector, or hold any civil or military office under the United States, or in any State, provided that he, as a federal or State officer, had sworn to support the Constitution and had afterward engaged in the Secession cause. But provision was made that by a two-thirds vote of each House this disability could be removed. General amnesty was not aimed at in the Bill, three classes of persons being excepted from relief. The Bill failed to become a law. These passages are given here by kind permission of the executors of General Schurz's estate.

had the conception of the Rebellion been still more wicked, had its incidents been still more terrible, its consequences still more harrowing, I could not permit myself to forget that in dealing with the question now before us we have to deal not alone with the past, but with the present and future interests of this republic.

What do we want to accomplish as good citizens and patriots? Do we mean only to inflict upon the late rebels pain, degredation, mortification, annoyance, for its own sake; to torture their feelings without any ulterior purpose? Certainly such a purpose could not by any possibility animate high-minded men. I presume, therefore, that those who still favor the continuance of some of the disabilities imposed by the Fourteenth Amendment do so because they have some higher object of public usefulness in view, an object of public usefulness sufficient to justify, in their minds at least, the denial of rights to others which we ourselves enjoy.

What can those objects of public usefulness be? Let me assume that, if we differ as to the means to be employed, we are agreed as to the supreme end and aim to be reached. That end and aim of our endeavors can be no other than to secure to all the States the blessings of good and free government and the highest degree of prosperity and well-being they can attain, and to revive in all citizens of this republic that love for the Union and its institutions, and that inspiring consciousness of a common nationality,

which, after all, must bind all Americans together.

What are the best means for the attainment of that end? This, sir, as I conceive it, is the only legitimate question we have to decide. Certainly all will agree that this end is far from having been attained so far. Look at the Southern States as they stand before us to-day. Some are in a condition bordering upon anarchy, not only on account of the social disorders which are occurring there, or the inefficiency of their local governments in securing the enforcement of the laws; but you will find in many of them fearful corruption pervading the whole political organization; a combination of rascality and ignorance wielding official power; their finances deranged by profligate practises; their credit ruined; bankruptcy staring them in the face; their industries staggering under a fearful load of taxation; their property-holders and capitalists paralyzed by a feeling of insecurity and distrust almost amounting to despair. Sir, let us not try to disguise these facts, for the world knows them to be so, and knows it but too well.

What are the causes that have contributed to bring about this distressing condition? I admit that great civil wars, resulting in such vast social transformations as the sudden abolition of slavery, are calculated to produce similar results; but it might be presumed that a recuperative power such as this country possesses might, during the time which has elapsed since the close

of the war, at least have very materially alleviated many of the consequences of that revulsion, had a wise policy been followed.

Was the policy we followed wise? Was it calculated to promote the great purposes we are endeavoring to serve? Let us see. At the close of the war we had to establish and secure free labor and the rights of the emancipated class. To that end we had to disarm those who could have prevented this, and we had to give the power of self-protection to those who needed it. For this reason temporary restrictions were imposed upon the late rebels, and we gave the right of suffrage to the colored people. Until the latter were enabled to protect themselves, political disabilities even more extensive than those which now exist rested upon the plea of eminent political necessity. I would be the last man to conceal that I thought so then, and I think there was very good reason for it.

But, sir, when the enfranchisement of the colored people was secured; when they had obtained the political means to protect themselves, then another problem began to loom up. It was not only to find new guarantees for the rights of the colored people, but it was to secure good and honest government to all. Let us not underestimate the importance of that problem, for in a great measure it includes the solution of the other. Certainly nothing could have been more calculated to remove the prevailing discontent concerning the changes that had taken place,

and to reconcile men's minds to the new order of things, than the tangible proof that that new order of things was practically working well; that it could produce a wise and economical administration of public affairs, and that it would promote general prosperity, thus healing the wounds of the past and opening to all the prospect of a future of material well-being and contentment.

And, on the other hand, nothing could have been more calculated to impede a general, hearty, and honest acceptance of the new order of things by the late rebel population than just those failures of public administration which involve the people in material embarrassments and so seriously disturb their comfort. In fact, good, honest, and successful government in the Southern States would in its moral effects, in the long run, have exerted a far more beneficial influence than all your penal legislation, while your penal legislation will fail in its desired effects if we fail in establishing in the Southern States an honest and successful administration of the public business.

Now, what happened in the South? It is a well-known fact that the more intelligent classes of Southern society almost uniformly identified themselves with the Rebellion; and by our system of political disabilities just those classes were excluded from the management of political affairs. That they could not be trusted with the business of introducting into living practise the results

of the war, to establish true free labor, and to protect the rights of the emancipated slaves, is true; I willingly admit it. But when those results and rights were constitutionally secured there were other things to be done. Just at that period when the Southern States lay prostrated and exhausted at our feet, when the destructive besom of war had swept over them and left nothing but desolation and ruin in its track, when their material interests were to be built up again with care and foresight—just then the public business demanded, more than ordinarily, the cooperation of all the intelligence and all the political experience that could be mustered in the Southern States. But just then a large portion of that intelligence and experience was excluded from the management of public affairs by political disabilities, and the controlling power in those States rested in a great measure in the hands of those who had but recently been slaves and just emerged from that condition, and in the hands of others who had sometimes honestly, sometimes by crooked means and for sinister purposes, found a way to their confidence.

But while the colored people of the South earned our admiration and gratitude, I ask you in all candor could they be reasonably expected, when, just after having emerged from a condition of slavery, they were invested with political rights and privileges, to step into the political arena as men armed with the intelligence and experience necessary for the management of pub-

lic affairs and for the solution of problems made doubly intricate by the disasters which had desolated the Southern country? Could they reasonably be expected to manage the business of public administration, involving to so great an extent the financial interests and the material well-being of the people, and surrounded by difficulties of such fearful perplexity, with the wisdom and skill required by the exigencies of the situation?

That as a class they were ignorant and inexperienced and lacked a just conception of public interests, was certainly not their fault; for those who have studied the history of the world know but too well that slavery and oppression are very bad political schools. But the stubborn fact remains that they *were* ignorant and inexperienced; that the public business *was* an unknown world to them; and that in spite of the best intentions they *were* easily misled, not infrequently by the most reckless rascality which had found a way to their confidence. Thus their political rights and privileges were undoubtedly well calculated, and even necessary to protect their rights as free laborers and citizens; but, they were not well calculated to secure a successful administration of other public interests.

But what did we do? To the uneducated and inexperienced classes—uneducated and inexperienced, I repeat, entirely without their fault—we opened the road to power; and, at the same time, we condemned a large proportion of the

intelligence of those States, of the property-holding, the industrial, the professional, the tax-paying interest, to a worse than passive attitude. We made it, as it were, easy for rascals who had gone South in quest of profitable adventure to gain the control of masses so easily misled, by permitting them to appear as the exponents and representatives of the national power and of our policy; and at the same time we branded a large number of men of intelligence, and many of them of personal integrity, whose material interests were so largely involved in honest government, and many of whom would have cooperated in managing the public business with care and foresight—we branded them, I say, as outcasts; telling them that they ought not to be suffered to exercise any influence upon the management of the public business, and it would be unwarrantable presumption in them to attempt it.

The introduction of the colored people, the late slaves, into the body-politic as voters, pointedly affronted the traditional prejudices prevailing among the Southern whites. What should we care about those prejudices? In war, nothing. After the close of the war, in the settlement of peace, not enough to deter us from doing what was right and necessary, and yet, still enough to take them into account when considering the manner in which right and necessity were to be served. Statesmen will care about popular prejudices as physicians will care about the diseased

condition of their patients, which they want to ameliorate. Would it not have been wise for us, looking at those prejudices as a morbid condition of the Southern mind, to mitigate, to assuage, to disarm them by prudent measures, and thus to weaken their evil influence?

We desired the Southern whites to accept in good faith universal suffrage, to recognize the political rights of the colored man, and to protect him in their exercise. Was not that our sincere desire? But if it was, would it not have been wise to remove as much as possible the obstacles that stood in the way of that consummation? But what did we do? When we raised the colored people to the rights of active citizenship and opened to them all the privileges of eligibility, we excluded from those privileges a large and influential class of whites; in other words, we lifted the late slave, uneducated and inexperienced as he was—I repeat, without his fault—not merely to the level of the late master class, but even above it. We asked certain white men to recognize the colored man in a political status not only as high but even higher than their own. We might say that under the circumstances we had a perfect right to do that, and I will not dispute it; but I ask you most earnestly, sir, was it wise to do it? If you desired the white man to accept and recognize the political equality of the black, was it wise to imbitter and exasperate his spirit with the stinging stigma of his own inferiority?

You tell me that the late rebels had deserved all this in the way of punishment. Granting that, I beg leave to suggest that this is not the question. The question is: What were the means best calculated to overcome the difficulties standing in the way of a willing and universal recognition of the new rights and privileges of the emancipated class? What were the means to overcome the hostile influences impending the development of the harmony of society in its new order? I am far from asserting that, had no disabilities existed, universal suffrage would have been received by the Southern whites with universal favor. No, sir, most probably it would not; but I do assert that the existence of disabilities, which put so large and influential a class of whites in point of political privileges below the colored people, could not fail to inflame those prejudices which stood in the way of a general and honest acceptance of the new order of things; they increased instead of diminishing the dangers and difficulties surrounding the emancipated class; and nobody felt that more keenly than the colored people of the South themselves. To their honor be it said, following a just instinct, they were among the very first, not only in the South but all over the country, in entreating Congress to remove those odious discriminations which put in jeopardy their own rights by making them greater than those of others. From the colored people themselves, it

seems, we have in this respect received a lesson in statesmanship.

Well, then, what policy does common sense suggest to us now? If we sincerely desire to give to the Southern States good and honest government, material prosperity, and measurable contentment, as far at least as we can contribute to that end; if we really desire to weaken and disarm those prejudices and resentments which still disturb the harmony of society, will it not be wise, will it not be necessary, will it not be our duty to show that we are in no sense the allies and abettors of those who use their political power to plunder their fellow citizens, and that we do not mean to keep one class of people in unnecessary degredation by withholding from them rights and privileges which all others enjoy? Seeing the mischief which the system of disabilities is accomplishing, is it not time that there should be at least an end of it; or is there any good it can possibly do to make up for the harm it has already wrought and is still working?

Look at it. Do these disabilities serve in any way to protect anybody in his rights or in his liberty or in his property or in his life? Does the fact that some men are excluded from office, in any sense or measure, make others more secure in their lives or in their property or in their rights? Can anybody tell me how? Or do they, perhaps, prevent even those who are excluded from official position from doing mischief if they are mischievously inclined? Does the

exclusion from office, does any feature of your system of political disabilities, take the revolver or the bowie-knife or the scourge from the hands of anyone who wishes to use it? Does it destroy the influence of the more intelligent upon society, if they mean to use that influence for mischievous purposes?

We accuse the Southern whites of having missed their chance of gaining the confidence of the emancipated class when, by a fairly demonstrated purpose of recognizing and protecting them in their rights, they might have acquired upon them a salutary influence. That accusation is by no means unjust; but must we not admit, also, that by excluding them from their political rights and privileges we put the damper of most serious discouragement upon the good intentions which might have grown up among them? Let us place ourselves in their situation, and then I ask you how many of us would, under the same circumstances have risen above the ordinary impulses of human nature to exert a salutary influence in defiance of our own prejudices, being so pointedly told every day that it was not the business of those laboring under political disabilities to meddle with public affairs at all? And thus, in whatever direction you may turn your eyes, you look in vain for any practical good your political disabilities might possibly accomplish. You find nothing, absolutely nothing, in their practical effects but the aggravation of evils already existing, and the prevention of a salutary development.

Is it not the part of wise men, sir, to acknowledge the failure of a policy like this in order to remedy it, especially since every candid mind must recognize that, by continuing the mistake, absolutely no practical good can be subserved?

You tell me that many of the late rebels do not deserve a full restoration of their rights. That may be so—I do not deny it; but yet, sir, if many of them do not deserve it, is it not a far more important consideration how much the welfare of the country will be promoted by it?

I am told that many of the late rebels, if we volunteer a pardon to them, would not appreciate it. I do not deny this—it may be so, for the race of fools, unfortunately, is not all dead yet; but if they do not appreciate it, shall we have no reason to appreciate the great good which by this measure of generosity will be conferred upon the whole land?

Look at the nations around us. In the Parliament of Germany how many men are there sitting who were once what you would call fugitives from justice, exiles on account of their revolutionary acts, now admitted to the great council of the nation in the fulness of their rights and privileges?—and mark you, without having been asked to abjure the opinions they formerly held, for at the present moment most of them still belong to the Liberal Opposition. Look at Austria, where Count Andrassy, a man who, in 1849, was condemned to the gallows as a rebel, at this moment stands at the head of the imperial ministry; and

those who know the history of that country are fully aware that the policy of which that amnesty was a part, which opened to Count Andrassy the road to power, has attached Hungary more closely than ever to the Austrian Crown, from which a narrow-minded policy of severity would have driven her.

Now, sir, ought not we to profit by the wisdom of such examples? It may be said that other governments were far more rigorous in their first repressive measures, and that they put off the grant of a general amnesty much longer after suppressing an insurrection than we are required to do. So they did; but is not this the great republic of the New World which marches in the very vanguard of modern civilization, and which, when an example of wisdom is set by other nations, should not only rise to its level, but far above it?

It seems now to be generally admitted that the time has come for a more comprehensive removal of political disabilities than has so far been granted. If that sentiment be sincere, if you really do desire to accomplish the greatest possible good by this measure that can be done, I would ask you what practical advantage do you expect to derive from the exclusions for which this bill provides? Look at them, one after another.

First, all those are excluded who, when the Rebellion broke out, were members of Congress, and left their seats in these halls to join it. Why

are these men to be excluded as a class? Because this class contains a number of prominent individuals, who, in the Rebellion, became practically conspicuous and obnoxious, and among them we find those whom we might designate as the original conspirators. But these are few, and they might have been mentioned by name. Most of those, however, who left their seats in Congress to make common cause with the rebels were in no way more responsible for the Rebellion than other prominent men in the South who do not fall under this exception. If we accept at all the argument that it will be well for the cause of good government and the material welfare of the South to readmit to the management of public affairs all the intelligence and political experience in those States, why, then, exclude as a class men who, having been members of Congress, may be presumed to possess a higher degree of that intelligence and experience than the rest? If you want that article at all for good purposes, I ask you, do you not want as large a supply of that article as you can obtain?

Leaving aside the original conspirators, is there any reason in the world why those members of Congress should be singled out from the numerous class of intelligent and prominent men who were or had been in office and had taken the same oath which is administered in these halls? Look at it! You do not propose to continue the disqualification of men who served this country as foreign ministers, who left their important

posts, betrayed the interests of this country in foreign lands to come back and join the Rebellion; you do not propose to exclude from the benefit of this act those who sat upon the bench and doffed the judicial ermine to take part in the Rebellion; and if such men are not to be disfranchised, why disfranchise the common run of the congressmen, whose guilt is certainly not greater, if it be as great? Can you tell me? Is it wise even to incur the suspicion of making an exception merely for the sake of excluding somebody, when no possible good can be accomplished by it, and when you can thus only increase the number of men incited to discontent and mischief by small and unnecessary degradations?

And now as to the original conspirators, what has become of them? Some of them are dead; and as to those who are still living, I ask you, sir, are they not dead also? Look at Jefferson Davis himself. What if you exclude even him—and certainly our feelings would naturally impel us to do so; but let our reason speak—what if you exclude even him? Would you not give him an importance which otherwise he never would possess, by making people believe that you are even occupying your minds enough with him to make him an exception to an act of generous wisdom? Truly to refrain from making an act of amnesty general on account of the original conspirators, candidly speaking, I would not consider worth while. I would not leave them the pitable distinction of not being pardoned. Your

very generosity will be to them the source of the bitterest disappointment. As long as they are excluded, they may still find some satisfaction in the delusion of being considered men of dangerous importance. Their very disabilities they look upon to-day as a recognition of their power. They may still make themselves and others believe that, were the Southern people only left free in their choice, they would eagerly raise them again to the highest honors.

So much for the first exception. Now to the second. It excludes from the benefit of this act all those who were officers of the army or of the navy and then joined the Rebellion. Why exclude that class of persons? I have heard the reason very frequently stated upon the floor of the Senate; it is because those men had been educated at the public expense, and their turning against the government was therefore an act of peculiar faithlessness and black ingratitude. That might appear a very argument at first sight. But I ask you was it not one of the very first acts of this administration to appoint one of the most prominent and conspicuous of that class to a very lucrative and respectable public office? I mean General Longstreet. He had obtained his military education at the expense of the American people. He was one of the wards, one of the pets of the American Republic, and then he turned against it as a rebel. Whatever of faithlessness, whatever of black ingratitude

there is in such conduct, it was in his; and yet, in spite of all this, the president nominated him for an office, and your consent, senators, made him a public dignitary.

Why did you break the rule in his case? I will not say that you did it because he had become a Republican, for I am far from attributing any mere partizan motive to your action. No; you did it because his conduct after the close of hostilities had been that of a well-disposed and law-abiding citizen. Thus, then, the rule which you, senators, have established for your own conduct is simply this: you will, in the case of officers of the army or the navy, waive the charge of peculiar faithlessness and ingratitude if the persons in question after the war had become law-abiding and well-disposed citizens. Well, is it not a fact universally recognized, and I believe entirely uncontradicted, that of all classes of men connected with the Rebellion there is not one whose conduct since the close of the war has been so unexceptionable, and in a great many instances so beneficial in its influence upon Southern society, as the officers of the army and the navy, especially those who before the war had been members of our regular establishments? Why, then, except them from this act of amnesty? If you take subsequent good conduct into account at all, these men are the very last who as a class ought to be excluded. And would it not be well to encourage them in well-doing by a sign on your part that they are not to be

looked upon as outcasts whose influence is not desired, even when they are inclined to use it for the promotion of the common welfare?

The third class excluded consists of those who were members of State conventions, and in those State conventions voted for ordinances of secession. If we may judge from the words which fell from the lips of the senator from Indiana, they were the objects of his particular displeasure. Why this? Here we have a large number of men of local standing who in some cases may have been leaders on a small scale, but most of whom were drawn into the whirl of the revolutionary movement just like the rest of the Southern population. If you accept the proposition that it will be well and wise to permit the intelligence of the country to participate in the management of the public business, the exclusion of just these people will appear especially inappropriate, because their local influence might be made peculiarly beneficial; and if you exclude these persons, whose number is considerable, you tell just that class of people whose cooperation might be made most valuable that their cooperation is not wanted, for the reason that, according to the meaning and intent of your system of disabilities, public affairs are no business of theirs.

You object that they are more guilty than the rest. Suppose they are—and in many cases I am sure they are only apparently so—but if they were not guilty of any wrong, they would need

no amnesty. Amnesty is made for those who bear a certain degree of guilt. Or would you indulge here in the solemn farce of giving pardon only to those who are presumably innocent? You grant your amnesty that it may bear good fruit; and if you do it for that purpose, then do not diminish the good fruit it may bear by leaving unplanted the most promising soil upon which it may grow.

Let me tell you it is the experience of all civilized nations the world over, when an amnesty is to be granted at all, the completest amnesty is always the best. Any limitation you may impose, however plausible it may seem at first sight, will be calculated to take away much of the virtue of that which is granted. I entreat you, then, in the name of the accumulated experience of history, let there be an end of these bitter and useless and disturbing questions; let the books be finally closed, and when the subject is for ever dismissed from our discussions and our minds, we shall feel as much relieved as those who are relieved of their political disabilities.

Sir, I have to say a few words about an accusation which has been brought against those who speak in favor of universal amnesty. It is the accusation resorted to, in default of more solid argument, that those who advise amnesty, especially universal amnesty, do so because they have fallen in love with the rebels. No, sir, it is not merely for the rebels I plead. We are asked, Shall the Rebellion go entirely unpunished?

No, sir, it shall not. Neither do I think that the Rebellion has gone entirely unpunished. I ask you, had the rebels nothing to lose but their lives and their offices? Look at it. There was a proud and arrogant aristocracy, planting their feet on the necks of the laboring people, and pretending to be the born rulers of this great Republic. They looked down, not only upon their slaves, but also upon the people of the North, with the haughty contempt of self-asserting superiority. When their pretensions to rule us all were first successfully disputed, they resolved to destroy this Republic, and to build up on the corner-stone of slavery an empire of their own in which they could hold absolute sway. They made the attempt with the most overweeningly confident expectation of certain victory.

Then came the Civil War, and after four years of struggle their whole power and pride lay shivered to atoms at our feet, their sons dead by tens of thousands on the battle-fields of this country, their fields and their homes devastated, their fortunes destroyed; and more than that, the whole social system in which they had their being, with all their hopes and pride, utterly wiped out; slavery for ever abolished, and the slaves themselves created a political power before which they had to bow their heads, and they, broken, ruined, helpless, and hopeless in the dust before those upon whom they had so haughtily looked down as their vassals and inferiors. Sir,

can it be said that the Rebellion has gone entirely unpunished?

You may object that the loyal people, too, were subjected to terrible sufferings; that their sons, too, were slaughtered by tens of thousands; that the mourning of countless widows and orphans is still darkening our land; that we are groaning under terrible burdens which the Rebellion has loaded upon us, and that therefore part of the punishment has fallen upon the innocent. And it is certainly true.

But look at the difference. We issued from this great conflict as conquerors; upon the graves of our slain we could lay the wreath of victory; our widows and orphans, while mourning the loss of their dearest, still remember with proud exultation that the blood of their husbands and fathers was not spilled in vain; that it flowed for the greatest and holiest and at the same time the most victorious of causes; and when our people labor in the sweat of their brow to pay the debt which the Rebellion has loaded upon us, they do it with the proud consciousness that the heavy price they have paid is infinitely overbalanced by the value of the results they have gained: slavery abolished; the great American Republic purified of her foulest stain; the American people no longer a people of masters and slaves, but a people of equal citizens; the most dangerous element of disturbance and disintegration wiped out from among us; this country put upon the

course of harmonious development, greater, more beautiful, mightier than ever in its self-conscious power. And thus, whatever losses, whatever sacrifices, whatever sufferings we may have endured, they appear before us in a blaze of glory.

But how do the Southern people stand there? All *they* have sacrificed, all *they* have lost, all the blood *they* have spilled, all the desolation of *their* homes, all the distress that stares *them* in the face, all the wreck and ruin *they* see around them—all for nothing; all for a wicked folly; all for a disastrous infatuation; the very graves of their slain nothing but monuments of a shadowy delusion; all their former hopes vanished for ever; and the very magniloquence which some of their leaders are still indulging in, nothing but a mocking illustration of their utter discomfiture! Ah, sir, if ever human efforts broke down in irretrievable disaster, if ever human pride was humiliated to the dust, if ever human hopes were turned into despair, there you behold them.

You may say that they deserved it all. Yes, but surely, sir, you can not say that the Rebellion has gone entirely unpunished. Nor will the senator from Indiana, with all his declamation (and I am sorry not now to see him before me), make any sane man believe that had no political disabilities ever been imposed, the history of the Rebellion, as long as the memory of men retains the recollection of the great story, will ever encourage a future generation to rebel again, or that if even this great example of disaster should

fail to extinguish the spirit of rebellion, his little scarecrow of exclusion from office will be more than a thing to be laughed at by little boys.

Sir, such appeals as these, which we have heard so frequently, may be well apt to tickle the ear of an unthinking multitude. But unless I am grievously in error, the people of the United States are a multitude not unthinking. The American people are fast becoming aware that, great as the crime of rebellion is, there are other villainies beside it; that, much as it may deserve punishment, there are other evils flagrant enough to demand energetic correction; that the remedy for such evils does, after all, not consist in the maintenance of political disabilities, and that it would be well to look behind those vociferous demonstrations of exclusive and austere patriotism to see what abuses and faults of policy they are to cover, and what rotten sores they are to disguise. The American people are fast beginning to perceive that good and honest government in the South, as well as throughout the whole country, restoring a measurable degree of confidence and contentment, will do infinitely more to revive true loyalty and a healthy national spirit, than keeping alive the resentments of the past by a useless degradation of certain classes of persons; and that we shall fail to do our duty unless we use every means to contribute our share to that end. And those, I apprehend, expose themselves to grievous disappointment who still think that, by dinning

again and again in the ears of the people the old battle-cries of the Civil War, they can befog the popular mind as to the true requirements of the times, and overawe and terrorize the public sentiment of the country.

But, sir, as the people of the North and of the South must live together as one people, and as they must be bound together by the bonds of a common national feeling, I ask you, will it not be well for us so to act that the history of our great civil conflict, which can not be forgotten, can never be remembered by Southern men without finding in its closing chapter this irresistible assurance: that we, their conquerors, meant to be, and were after all, not their enemies, but their friends? When the Southern people con over the distressing catalog of the misfortunes they have brought upon themselves, will it not be well, will it not be "devoutly to be wished" for our common future, if at the end of that catalog they find an act which will force every fair-minded man in the South to say of the Northern people, "When we were at war they inflicted upon us the severities of war; but when the contest had closed and they found us prostrate before them, grievously suffering, surrounded by the most perplexing difficulties and on the brink of new disasters, they promptly swept all the resentments of the past out of their way and stretched out their hands to us with the very fullest measure of generosity—anxious, eager to lift us up from our prostration?"

Sir, will not this do something to dispel those mists of error and prejudice which are still clouding the Southern mind? I ask again, will it not be well to add to the sad memories of the past which for ever will live in their minds, this cheering experience, so apt to prepare them for the harmony of a better and common future?

No, sir, I would not have the past forgotten, but I would have its history completed and crowned by an act most worthy of a great, noble, and wise people. By all the means which we have in our hands, I would make even those who have sinned against this republic see in its flag, not the symbol of their lasting degradation, but of rights equal to all; I would make them feel in their hearts that in its good and evil fortunes their rights and interest are bound up just as ours are, and that therefore its peace, its welfare, its honor, and its greatness may and ought to be as dear to them as they are to us.

I do not, indeed, indulge in the delusion that this act alone will remedy all the evils which we now deplore. No, it will not; but it will be a powerful appeal to the very best instincts and impulses of human nature; it will, like a warm ray of sunshine in springtime, quicken and call to light the germs of good intention wherever they exist; it will give new courage, confidence, and inspiration to the well-disposed; it will weaken the power of the mischievous, by stripping off their pretexts and exposing in their nakedness the wicked designs they still may cher-

ish; it will light anew the beneficent glow of fraternal feeling and of national spirit; for, sir, your good sense as well as your heart must tell you that, when this is truly a people of citizens equal in their political rights, it will then be easier to make it also a people of brothers.

GREELEY

DURING HIS CAMPAIGN FOR PRESIDENT[1]

(1872)

Born in 1811, died in 1872; founded the New York *Tribune* in 1841; elected to Congress in 1848; a notable antislavery leader; an unsuccessful candidate for President in 1872; author of "Recollections of a Busy Life."

It is certain that throughout the course of my life, as far as I have been connected with public affairs, I have struggled with such capacity as God has given me, for: first, impartial and universal liberty; secondly, for the unity and greatness of our common country; thirdly, and by no means last, when the former end was attained, for an early and hearty reconciliation and peace among our countrymen. For these great ends I have struggled, and I hope the issue is not doubtful.

Those adverse to me ask what pledges I have given to those lately hostile to the Union to secure their favor and support. I answer, no man or woman in all the South ever asked of me, directly or through another, any other pledge

[1] Greeley was nominated in May, 1872. His first formal speech in the campaign was the one here given, delivered at Portland, Maine, on August 14. The New York *Herald*, from which the following report is taken, described Greeley, as he entered the hall to deliver this speech, as wearing "his historical white hat, his black alpaca coat, white vest, and black pants [*sic*], and carrying his white overcoat on his arm."

than is given through all my acts and words. From the hour of Lee's surrender down to this moment, no Southern man has ever hinted to me an expectation, hope, or wish that the rebel debt, whether Confederate or State, should be assumed or paid by the Union, and no Southern man who could be elected to a legislature or made colonel of a militia regiment, has suggested the pension of the rebel soldiers, or any of them, even as a remote possibility.

All who nominated me were perfectly aware that I had upheld and justified Federal legislation to repress Kuklux conspiracy and outrage, tho I have long ago insisted as strenuously as I do now that complete amnesty and general oblivion of the bloody and hateful past would do more for the suppression and utter extinction of such outrages than all the force bills and suspensions of habeas corpus ever devised by man. Wrong and crime must be suppressed and punished, but far wiser and nobler is the legislation, the policy, by which they are prevented.

From those who support me in the South I have heard but one demand—justice; but one desire—reconciliation. They wish to be heartily reunited with the North on any terms which do not involve the surrender of their manhood. They ask that they should be regarded and treated by the Federal authorities as citizens, not as culprits, so long as they obey and uphold every law consistent with equality and right. They desire a rule which, alike for white and

black, shall encourage industry and thrift and discourage rapacity and villainy. They cherish a joyful hope, in which I fully concur, that between the fifth of November and the fourth of March next, a number of the governors and other dignitaries who in the absurd name of republicanism and loyalty have for years been piling debts and taxes upon their war-wasted States, will follow the wholesome example of Bullock of Georgia and seek the shades of private life. The darker and deeper those shades, the better for themselves and for mankind; and the hope that my election may hasten the much desired hegira of thieving carpetbaggers has reconciled to the necessity of supporting me many who would otherwise have hesitated and probably refused.

Fellow citizens, the deposed and partially exiled Tammany ring has stolen about $30,000,000 from the City of New York; that was a most gigantic robbery and hurled its contrivers and abettors from power and splendor to impotency and infamy; but the thieving carpetbaggers have stolen at least three times that amount—stolen it from the impoverished and needy—and they still flaunt their prosperous villainy in the highest places in the land, and are addressed as "Honorable" and "Excellency."

I think I hear a voice from the honest people of all the States declaring their infamy shall be gainful and insolent no longer—at the furthest, until the fourth of March next. By that time those criminals will have heard a national

verdict pronounced that will cause them to "fold their tents like the Arabs" and as silently steal away, and that I trust will be the end of their stealing at the cost of the good name of our country and the well-being of our people.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

ON WOMAN'S RIGHT TO THE SUFFRAGE[1]

(1873)

Born in 1820, died in 1906; in early life a social reformer and advocate of the suffrage and other civil rights for women, with which she remained through life closely identified.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS:—I stand before you to-night under indictment for the alleged crime of having voted at the last presidential election, without having a lawful right to vote. It shall be my work this evening to prove to you that in thus voting, I not only committed no crime, but, instead, simply exercised my *citizen's rights,* guaranteed to me and all United States citizens by the National Constitution, beyond the power of any State to deny. * * * * The preamble of the Federal Constitution says:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure *domestic* tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

It was we, the people; not we, the white male

[1] Delivered in 1873 after she had been arrested, put on trial, and fined one hundred dollars for voting at the presidential election in 1872. She refused to pay the fine and never did pay it.

citizens; nor yet we, the male citizens; but we, the whole people, who formed the Union. And we formed it, not to give the blessings of liberty, but to secure them; not to the half of ourselves and the half of our posterity, but to the whole people—women as well as men. And it is a downright mockery to talk to women of their enjoyment of the blessings of liberty while they are denied the use of the only means of securing them provided by this democratic-republican government—the ballot.

For any State to make sex a qualification that must ever result in the disfranchisement of one entire half of the people is to pass a bill of attainder, or an *ex post facto* law, and is therefore a violation of the supreme law of the land. By it the blessings of liberty are for ever withheld from women and their female posterity. To them this government has no just powers derived from the consent of the governed. To them this government is not a democracy. It is not a republic. It is an odious aristocracy; a hateful oligarchy of sex; the most hateful aristocracy ever established on the face of the globe; an oligarchy of wealth, where the rich govern the poor. An oligarchy of learning, where the educated govern the ignorant, or even an oligarchy of race, where the Saxon rules the African, might be endured; but this oligarchy of sex, which makes father, brothers, husband, sons, the oligarchs over the mother and sisters, the wife and daughters of every household—which ordains

all men sovereigns, all women subjects, carries dissension, discord and rebellion into every home of the nation.

Webster, Worcester and Bouvier all define a citizen to be a person in the United States, entitled to vote and hold office.

The only question left to be settled now is: Are women persons? And I hardly believe any of our opponents will have the hardihood to say they are not. Being persons, then, women are citizens; and no State has a right to make any law, or to enforce any old law, that shall abridge their privileges or immunities. Hence, every discrimination against women in the constitutions and laws of the several States is to-day null and void, precisely as in every one against negroes.

LAMAR

ON SUMNER AND THE SOUTH[1]

(1874)

Born in 1825, died in 1893; elected to Congress from Mississippi in 1857; served in the Confederacy in the Civil War; elected to Congress in 1873; a United States Senator, 1877–85; Secretary of the Interior in 1885; Justice of the Supreme Court in 1888.

It was certainly a gracious act on the part of Charles Sumner toward the South, tho unhappily it jarred on the sensibilities of the people at the other extreme of the Union, to propose to erase from the banners of the national army the mementoes of the bloody internal struggle which might be regarded as assailing the pride or wounding the sensibilities of the Southern people. The proposal will never be forgotten by that people so long as the name of Charles Sumner lives in the memory of man.

But while it touched the heart and elicited her profound gratitude, her people would not have asked of the North such an act of self-renunciation. Conscious that they themselves were animated by devotion to constitutional liberty, and that the brighest pages of history are replete with evidences of the depth and sincerity of that devotion, they can but cherish the recol-

[1] From a speech in the House of Representatives on April 23, 1874—soon after the death of Sumner.

lection of the battles fought and the victories won in defense of their hopeless cause; and respecting, as all true and brave men must respect, the martial spirit with which the men of the North vindicated the integrity of the Union, and their devotion to the principles of human freedom, they do not ask, they do not wish the North to strike the mementoes of heroism and victory from either records or monuments or battle-flags. They would rather that both sections should gather up the glories won by each section, not envious, but proud of each other, and regard them as a common heritage of American valor. Let us hope that future generations, when they remember the deeds of heroism and devotion done on both sides, will speak, not of Northern prowess or Southern courage, but of the heroism, courage and fortitude of the Americans in a war of ideas—a war in which each section signalized its consecration to the principles, as each understood them, of American liberty and of the Constitution received from their fathers.

Charles Sumner in life believed that all occasion for strife and distrust between the North and South had passed away, and there no longer remained any cause for continued estrangement between those two sections of our common country. Are there not many of us who believe the same thing? Is not that the common sentiment, or if not, ought it not to be, of the great mass of our people, North and South? Bound to each other by a common constitution, destined to

live together under a common government, forming unitedly but a single member of the great family of nations, shall we not now at last endeavor to grow toward each other once more in heart, as we are indissolubly linked to each other in fortunes? Shall we not, while honoring the memory of this great champion of liberty, this feeling sympathizer with human sorrow, this earnest pleader for the exercise of human tenderness and heavenly charity, lay aside the concealments which serve only to perpetuate misunderstandings and distrust, and frankly confess that on both sides we most earnestly desire to be one—one not merely in political organization; one not merely in community of language, and literature, and traditions, and country; but more and better than all that, one also in feeling and in heart?

Am I mistaken in this? Do the concealments of which I speak still cover animosities, which neither time nor reflection nor the march of events have yet sufficed to subdue? I can not believe it. Since I have been here I have scrutinized your sentiments, as expressed not merely in public debate, but in the abandon of personal confidence. I know well the sentiments of these my Southern friends, whose hearts are so infolded that the feeling of each is the feeling of all; and I see on both sides only the seeming of a constraint which each apparently hesitates to dismiss.

The South—prostrate, exhausted, drained of

her life-blood as well as her material resources, yet still honorable and true—accepts the bitter award of the bloody arbitrament without reservation, resolutely determined to abide the result with chivalrous fidelity. Yet, as if struck dumb by the magnitude of her reverses, she suffers on in silence. The North, exultant in her triumph and elevated by success, still cherishes, as we are assured, a heart full of magnanimous emotions toward her disarmed and discomfited antagonist; and yet, as if under some mysterious spell, her words and acts are words and acts of suspicion and distrust. Would that the spirit of the illustrious dead, whom we lament to-day, could speak from the grave to both parties to this deplorable discord, in tones which would reach each and every heart throughout this broad territory: My countrymen! know one another and you will love one another.

CURTIS

HIS ORATION AT CONCORD[1]

(1875)

Born in 1824, died in 1892; member of the Brook Farm community; connected with *Harper's Magazine* and *Harper's Weekly* from 1854 and 1863 until his death; made a Commissioner to devise rules for the Civil Service in 1871, but resigned because of differences with President Grant; President of the Civil Service National Reform League from its formation until his death.

We are fortunate that we behold this day. The heavens bend benignly over, the earth blossoms with renewed life, and our hearts beat joyfully together with one emotion of filial gratitude and patriotic exultation. Citizens of a great, free, and prosperous country, we come hither to honor the men, our fathers, who, on this spot and upon this day, a hundred years ago, struck the first blow in the contest which made that country independent. Here beneath the hills they trod, by the peaceful river on whose shores they dwelt, amid the fields that they sowed and reaped, proudly recalling their virtue and their valor, we come to tell their story, to try ourselves by their lofty standard to know if we are their worthy children; and,

[1] From an oration delivered at the Centennial celebration of the Battle of Concord, on April 19, 1875. Copyright 1894 by Harper & Brothers.

standing reverently where they stood and fought and died, to swear before God and each other, in the words of him upon whom in our day the spirit of the revolutionary fathers visibly descended, that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

This ancient town with its neighbors who share its glory, has never failed fitly to commemorate this great day of its history. Fifty years ago, while some soldiers of the Concord fight were yet living—twenty-five years ago, while still a few venerable survivors lingered—with prayer and eloquence and song you renewed the pious vow. But the last living link with the Revolution has long been broken. Great events and a mightier struggle have absorbed our own generation. Yet we who stand here to-day have a sympathy with the men at the old North Bridge which those who preceded us here at earlier celebrations could not know. With them war was a name and a tradition. So swift and vast had been the change and the development of the country that the revolutionary clash of arms was already vague and unreal, and Concord and Lexington seemed to them almost as remote and historic as Arbela and Sempach. When they assembled to celebrate this day they saw a little group of tottering forms, eyes from which the light was fading, arms nerveless and withered, thin white hairs that fluttered in the wind—they saw a few venerable relics of a van-

ished age, whose pride was that before living memory they had been minute-men of American Independence.

But with us how changed! War is no longer a tradition half romantic and obscure. It has ravaged how many of our homes! it has wrung how many of the hearts before me! North and South, we know the pang. Our common liberty is consecrated by a common sorrow. We do not count around us a few feeble veterans of the contest, but are girt with a cloud of witnesses. We are surrounded everywhere by multitudes in the vigor of their prime—behold them here to-day sharing in these pious and peaceful rites, the honored citizens, legislators, magistrates—yes, the chief magistrate of the Republic—whose glory it is that they were minute-men of American liberty and union. These men of to-day interpret to us with resistless eloquence the men and the times we commemorate. Now, if never before, we understand the Revolution. Now we know the secret of those old hearts and homes. We can measure the sacrifice, the courage, the devotion, for we have seen them all. Green hills of Concord, broad fields of Middlesex, that heard the voice of Hancock and of Adams, you heard also the call of Lincoln and of Andrew, and your Ladd and Whitney, your Prescott and Ripley and Melvin, have revealed to us more truly the Davis and the Buttrick, the Hosmer and the Parker, of a hundred years ago.

At the end of a century we can see the work as our fathers could not; we can see that then the final movement began of a process long and unconsciously preparing, which was to intrust liberty to new forms and institutions that seemed full of happy promise for mankind. And now for nearly a century what was formerly called the experiment of a representative republic of imperial extent and power has been tried. Has it fulfilled the hopes of its founders and the just expectations of mankind? I have already glanced at its early and fortunate conditions, and we know how vast and splendid were its early growth and development. Our material statistics soon dazzled the world. Europe no longer sneered but gazed in wonder, waiting and watching. Our population doubled every fifteen years, and our wealth every ten years. Every little stream among the hills turned a mill; and the great inland seas, bound by the genius of Clinton to the ocean, became the highway of boundless commerce, the path of unprecedented empire. Our farms were the granary of other lands. Our cotton fields made England rich. Still we chased the whale in the Pacific Ocean and took fish in the tumbling seas of Labrador. We hung our friendly lights along thousands of miles of coast to tempt the trade of every clime; and wherever, on the dim rim of the globe there was a harbor, it was white with American sails. Meanwhile at home the political foreboding of federalism had died away,

and its very wail seemed a tribute to the pacific glories of the land.

> "The ornament of beauty is suspect,
> A crow that flies in heaven's sweetest air."

The government was felt to be but a hand of protection and blessing; labor was fully employed; capital was secured; the army was a jest; enterprise was pushing through the Alleghanies, grasping and settling the El Dorado of the prairies, and still braving the wilderness, reached out toward the Rocky Mountains, and reversing the voyages of Columbus, rediscovered the Old World from the New. America was the Benjamin of nations, the best beloved of heaven, and the starry flag of the United States flashed a line of celestial light around the world, the harbinger of freedom, peace, and prosperity.

Think, for instance, of the change wrought by foreign immigration, with all its necessary consequences. In the State of Massachusetts to-day the number of citizens of foreign birth who have no traditional association with the story of Concord and Lexington is larger than the entire population of the State on the day of battle. The first fifty years after the battle brought to the whole country fewer immigants than are now living in Massachusetts alone. At the end of that half century, when Mr. Everett stood here, less than three hundred thousand foreign immigrants had come to this country; but in the fifty years that have since elapsed, that immigra-

tion has been more than nine millions of persons. The aggregate population in the last fifty years has advanced somewhat more than threefold, the foreign immigration more than thirtyfold, so that now immigrants and the children of immigrants are a quarter of the whole population.

This enormous influx of foreigners has added an immense ignorance and entire unfamiliarity with republican ideas and habits to the voting class. It has brought other political traditions, other languages and other religious faiths. It has introduced powerful and organized influences not friendly to the republican principle of freedom of thought and action. It is to the change produced by immigration that we owe the first serious questioning of the public school system, which was the nursery of the early republic, and which is to-day the palladium of free popular government.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not lamenting even in thought the boundless hospitality of America. I do not forget that the whole European race came hither but yesterday, and has been domesticated here not yet three hundred years. I am not insensible of the proud claim of America to be the refuge of the oppressed of every clime; nor do I doubt in her maturity, her power, if duly directed, to assimilate whole nations, if need be, as in her infancy she achieved her independence, and in her prime maintained her unity. But if she has been the hope of the world, and is so still, it is because she has under-

stood both the conditions and the perils of freedom, and watches carefully the changing conditions under which republican liberty is to be maintained. She will still welcome to her ample bosom all who choose to be called her children. But if she is to remain the mother of liberty, it will not be the result of those craven counsels whose type is the ostrich burying his head in the sand, but of that wise and heroic statesmanship whose symbol is her own heaven-soaring eagle, gazing undazzled even at the spots upon the sun.

Again, within the century steam has enormously expanded the national domain, and every added mile is an added strain to our system. The marvelous ease of communication both by rail and telegraph tends to obliterate conservative local lines and to make a fatal centralization more possible. The telegraph, which instantly echoes the central command at the remotest point, becomes both a facility and a temptation to exercise command, while below upon the rail the armed blow swiftly follows the word that flies along the wire. Steam concentrates population in cities. But when the government was formed the people were strictly rural, and there were but six cities with eight thousand inhabitants or more. In 1790 only one-thirtieth of the population lived in cities, in 1870 more than one-fifth. Steam destroys the natural difficulties of communication; but those very difficulties are barriers against invasion,

and protect the independence of each little community, the true foundation of our free republican system. In New England the characteristic village and local life of the last century perishes in the age of steam. Meanwhile the enormous accumulation of capital engaged in great enterprises, with unscrupulous greed of power, constantly tends to make itself felt in corruption of the Press which molds public opinion, and of the Legislature which makes the laws.

But the most formidable problem for popular government which the opening of our second century presents, springs from a source which was unsuspected a hundred years ago, and which the orators of fifty years since forbore to name. This was the system of slave labor which vanished in civil war. But slavery had not been the fatal evil that it was, if with its abolition its consequences had disappeared. It holds us still in mortmain. Its dead hand is strong, as its living power was terrible. Emancipation has left the Republic exposed to a new and extraordinary trial of the principles and practises of free government. A civilization resting upon slavery, as formerly in part of the country, however polished and ornate, is necessarily aristocratic and hostile to republican equality, while the exigencies of such a society forbid that universal education which is indispensable to wise popular government. When war emancipates the slaves and makes them equal citizens, the ignorance and venality which are the fatal legacies

of slavery to the subject-class, whether white or black, and the natural alienation of the master-class, which alone has political knowledge and experience, with all the secret conspiracies, the reckless corruption, the political knavery, springing naturally from such a situation, and ending often in menacing disorder that seems to invite the military interference and supervision of the government—all this accumulation of difficulty and danger lays a strain along the very fiber of free institutions.

These are some of the more obvious changes in the conditions under which the Republic is to be maintained. I mention them merely; but every wise patriot sees and ponders them. Does he therefore despond? Heaven forbid! When was there ever an auspicious day for humanity that was not one of doubt and of conflict? The robust moral manhood of America confronts the future with steadfast faith and indomitable will, raising the old battle-cry of the race for larger liberty and surer law. It sees clouds, indeed, as Sam Adams saw them when this day dawned. But with him it sees through and through them, and with him thanks God for the glorious morning. There is, indeed, a fashion of skepticism of American principles even among some Americans, but it is one of the oldest and worst fashions in our history. There is a cynicism which fondly fancies that in its beginning the American Republic moved proudly toward the future with all the splendid assurances of the

Persian Xerxes descending on the shores of Greece, but that it sits to-day among shattered hopes, like Xerxes above his ships at Salamis.

And when was this golden age? Was it when John Adams appealed from the baseness of his own time to the greater candor and patriotism of this? Was it when Fisher Ames mourned over lost America like Rachel for her children, and would not be comforted? Was it when William Wirt said that he sought in vain for a man fit for the presidency or for great responsibility? Was it when Chancellor Livingston saw only a threatening future because Congress was so feeble? Was it when we ourselves saw the industry, the commerce, the society, the church, the courts, the statesmanship, the conscience of America seemingly prostrate under the foot of slavery? Was this the golden age of these sentimental sighs, this the region behind the north wind of these reproachful regrets? And is it the young nation which with prayer and faith, with untiring devotion and unconquerable will, has lifted its bruised and broken body from beneath that crushing heel, whose future is distrusted?

Nay, this very cynicism is one of the foes that we must meet and conquer. Remember, fellow citizens, that the impulse of republican government, given a century ago at the old North Bridge, has shaken every government in the world, but has been itself wholly unshaken by them. It has made monarchy impossible in France.

It has freed the Russian serfs. It has united Germany against ecclesiastical despotism. It has flashed into the night of Spain. It has emancipated Italy and discrowned the pope as king. In England, repealing the disabilities of Catholic and Hebrew, it forecasts the separation of Church and State, and step by step transforms monarchy into another form of republic.

And here at home, how glorious its story! In a tremendous war between men of the same blood —men who recognize and respect each other's valor—we have proved what was always doubted: the prodigious power, endurance and resources of a republic; and in emancipating an eighth of the population we have at last gained the full opportunity of the republican principle. Sir, it is the signal felicity of this occasion that on the one hundredth anniversary of the first battle of the war of American independence, I may salute you, who led to victory the citizen soldiers of American liberty, as the first elected president of the free Republic of the United States. Fortunate man! to whom God has given the priceless boon of associating your name with that triumph of freedom which will presently bind the East and the West, the North and the South, in a closer and more perfect union for the establishment of justice and the security of the blessings of liberty than these States have ever known.

Fellow citizens, that union is the lofty task which this hallowed day and this sacred spot

impose upon us. And what cloud of doubt so dark hangs over us as that which lowered above the Colonies when the troops of the king marched into the town, and the men of Middlesex resolved to pass the bridge? With their faith and their will we shall win their victory. No royal governor, indeed, sits in yon stately capital, no hostile fleet for many a year has vexed the waters of our coasts, nor is any army but our own ever likely to tread our soil. Not such are our enemies to-day. They do not come proudly stepping to the drum-beat. with bayonets flashing in the morning sun.

But wherever party spirit shall strain the ancient guarantees of freedom, or bigotry and ignorance shall lay their fatal hands upon education, or the arrogance of caste shall strike at equal rights, or corruption shall poison the very springs of national life, there, minute-men of liberty, are your Lexington Green and Concord Bridge, and as you love your country and your kind, and would have your children rise up and call you blessed, spare not the enemy! Over the hills, out of the earth, down from the clouds, pour in resistless might. Fire from every rock and tree, from door and window, from hearthstone and chamber; hang upon his flank and rear from noon to sunset, and so through a land blazing with holy indignation hurl the hordes of ignorance and corruption and injustice back, back, in utter defeat and ruin.

INGERSOLL

I

HIS SPEECH NOMINATING BLAINE FOR PRESIDENT[1]

(1876)

Born in 1833, died in 1899; began to practise law at Peoria, Illinois, in 1857; Colonel of Cavalry in 1862; Attorney-General for Illinois in 1866; afterward settled in New York, where he gained wide reputation as a lecturer and lawyer.

MASSACHUSETTS may be satisfied with the loyalty of Benjamin H. Bristow—so am I; but if any man nominated by this convention can not carry the State of Massachusetts I am not satisfied with the loyalty of that State. If the nominee of this convention can not carry the grand old Commonwealth of Massachusetts by seventy-five thousand majority, I would advise them to sell out Faneuil Hall as a Democratic headquarters. I would advise them to take from Bunker Hill that old monument of glory.

The Republicans of the United States demand as their leader in the great contest of 1876 a man of intellect, a man of integrity, a man of well-known and approved political opinion. They de-

[1] Delivered in the Republican National Convention at Cincinnati, June 15, 1876. As printed in the New York *Times* on the following day.

mand a statesman. They demand a reformer after, as well as before, the election. They demand a politician in the highest and broadest and best sense of that word. They demand a man acquainted with public affairs—with the wants of the people—with not only the requirements of the hour, but with the demands of the future.

They demand a man broad enough to comprehend the relations of this government to the other nations of the earth. They demand a man well versed in the powers, duties, and prerogatives of each and every department of this government.

They demand a man who will sacredly preserve the financial honor of the United States—one who knows enough to know that the national debt must be paid through the prosperity of this people. One who knows enough to know that all the financial theories in the world can not redeem a single dollar. One who knows enough to know that all the money must be made, not by law, but by labor. One who knows enough to know that the people of the United States have the industry to make the money and the honor to pay it over just as fast as they make it.

The Republicans of the United States demand a man who knows that prosperity and resumption, when they come, must come together. When they come they will come hand in hand through the golden harvest fields; hand in hand by the whirling spindle and the turning wheel; hand in

hand past the open furnace doors; hand in hand by the flaming forges; hand in hand by the chimneys filled with eager fire by the hands of the countless sons of toil. This money has got to be dug out of the earth. You can not make it by passing resolutions in a political meeting.

The Republicans of the United States want a man who knows that this government should protect every citizen at home and abroad; who knows that any government that will defend its defenders and will not protect its protectors is a disgrace to the map of the world. They demand a man who believes in the eternal separation and divorcement of church and school. They demand a man whose political reputation is spotless as a star; but they do not demand that their candidate shall have a certificate of moral character signed by a Confederate Congress. The man who has in full-heaped and rounded measure all of these splendid qualifications is the present grand and gallant leader of the Republican party—James G. Blaine.

Our country, crowned with the vast and marvelous achievements of its first century, asks for a man worthy of her past—prophetic of her future; asks for a man who has the audacity of genius; asks for a man who is the grandest combination of heart, conscience, and brains beneath the flag. That man is James G. Blaine.

For the Republican host led by that intrepid man there can be no such thing as defeat.

This is a grand year—a year filled with the

recollections of the Revolution; filled with proud and tender memories of the sacred past; filled with the legends of liberty; a year in which the sons of freedom will drink from the fountain of enthusiasm; a year in which the people call for a man who has preserved in Congress what our soldiers won upon the field; a year in which we call for the man who has torn from the throat of treason the tongue of slander—a man that has snatched the mask of democracy from the hideous face of rebellion—a man who, like an intellectual athlete, stood in the arena of debate, challenged all comers, and who, up to the present moment, is a total stranger to defeat.

Like an armed warrior, like a plumed knight, James G. Blaine marched down the halls of the American Congress and threw his shining lances full and fair against the brazen foreheads of every defamer of his country and maligner of its honor.

For the Republican party to desert a gallant man now is worse than if an army should desert their general upon the field of battle.

James G. Blaine is now, and has been for years, the bearer of the sacred standard of the Republic. I call it sacred because no human being can stand beneath its folds without becoming, and without remaining, free.

Gentlemen of the Convention, in the name of the great Republic, the only republic that ever existed upon this earth; in the name of all her defenders and of all her supporters; in the name

of all her soldiers living; in the name of all her soldiers who died upon the field of battle; and in the name of those who perished in the skeleton clutch of famine at Andersonville and Libby, whose sufferings he so eloquently remembers, Illinois nominates for the next president of this country that prince of parliamentarians, that leader of leaders—James G. Blaine.

II

AT HIS BROTHER'S GRAVE[1]

(1879)

My Friends:—I am going to do that which the dead oft promised he would do for me.

The loved and loving brother, husband, father, friend, died where manhood's morning almost touches noon, and while the shadows still were falling toward the west.

He had not passed on life's highway the stone that marks the highest point, but, being weary for a moment, lay down by the wayside, and, using his burden for a pillow, fell into that dreamless sleep that kisses down his eyelids still. While yet in love with life and raptured with the world, he passed to silence and pathetic dust.

Yet, after all, it may be best, just in the happiest, sunniest hour of all the voyage, while eager

[1] Delivered in Washington on June 3, 1879, at the funeral of Ebon C. Ingersoll. Printed in the New York *Tribune* on the following day.

winds are kissing every sail, to dash against the unseen rock, and in an instant hear the billows roar above a sunken ship. For, whether in mid-sea or 'mong the breakers of the farther shore, a wreck at last must mark the end of each and all. And every life, no matter if its every hour is rich with love and every moment jeweled with a joy, will, at its close, become a tragedy as sad and deep and dark as can be woven of the warp and woof of mystery and death.

This brave and tender man in every storm of life was oak and rock, but in the sunshine he was vine and flower. He was the friend of all heroic souls. He climbed the heights and left all superstitions far below, while on his forehead fell the golden dawning of the grander day.

He loved the beautiful, and was with color, form, and music touched to tears. He sided with the weak, and with a willing hand gave alms; with loyal heart and with purest hands he faithfully discharged all public trusts.

He was a worshiper of liberty, a friend of the oppressed. A thousand times I have heard him quote these words: "For justice all place a temple, and all seasons, summer." He believed that happiness was the only good, reason the only torch, justice the only worship, humanity the only religion, and love the only priest. He added to the sum of human joy; and were every one to whom he did some loving service to bring a blossom to his grave, he would sleep to-night beneath a wilderness of flowers.

Life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights. We cry aloud, and the only answer is the echo of our wailing cry. From the voiceless lips of the unreplying dead there comes no word; but in the night of death hope sees a star, and listening love can hear the rustle of a wing.

He who sleeps here, when dying, mistaking the approach of death for the return of health, whispered with his last breath: "I am better now." Let us believe, in spite of doubts and dogmas, and tears and fears, that these dear words are true of all the countless dead.

And now to you who have been chosen, from among the many men he loved, to do the last sad office for the dead, we give his sacred dust. Speech can not contain our love. There was, there is, no greater, stronger, manlier man.

MOODY

WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?[1]

Born in 1837, died in 1899; became engaged in missionary work in Chicago about 1856; conducted revival meetings in the United States and Great Britain with Ira D. Sankey, 1873–1883; established a school for Christian workers in Northfield, Massachusetts, and a Bible Institute in Chicago.

I SUPPOSE there is no one here who has not thought more or less about Christ. You have heard about him, and read about him, and heard men preach about him. For eighteen hundred years men have been talking about him and thinking about him; and some have their minds made up about who he is, and doubtless some have not. And altho all these years have rolled away, this question comes up, addressed to each of us, to-day, "What think ye of Christ?"

I do not know why it should not be thought a proper question for one man to put to another. If I were to ask you what you think of any of your prominent men, you would already have your mind made up about him. If I were to ask you what you thought of your noble queen, you would speak right out and tell me your opinion in a minute.

If I were to ask about your prime minister,

[1] From a sermon preached in England during his tour with Ira D. Sankey in 1873–75.

you would tell me freely what you had for or against him. And why should not people make up their minds about the Lord Jesus Christ, and take their stand for or against him? If you think well of him, why not speak well of him and range yourselves on his side? And if you think ill of him, and believe him to be an impostor, and that he did not die to save the world, why not lift up your voice and say you are against him? It would be a happy day for Christianity if men would just take sides—if we could know positively who was really for him and who was against him.

It is of very little importance what the world thinks of any one else. The queen and the statesmen, the peers and the princes, must soon be gone. Yes; it matters little, comparatively, what we think of them. Their lives can interest only a few; but every living soul on the face of the earth is concerned with this Man. The question for the world is, "What think ye of Christ?"

I do not ask you what you think of the Established Church, or of the Presbyterians, or the Baptists, or the Roman Catholics; I do not ask you what you think of this minister or that, of this doctrine or that; but I want to ask you what you think of the living person of Christ?

I should like to ask, Was he really the Son of God—the great God-Man? Did he leave heaven and come down to this world for a purpose? Was it really to seek and to save? I should like to

begin with the manger, and follow him up through the thirty-three years he was here upon earth. I should ask you what you think of his coming into this world and being born in a manger when it might have been a palace; why he left the grandeur and the glory of heaven, and the royal retinue of angels; why he passed by palaces and crowns and dominion and came down here alone?

I should like to ask you what you think of him as a teacher. He spake as never man spake. I should like to take him up as a preacher. I should like to bring you to that mountainside, that we might listen to the words as they fall from his gentle lips. Talk about the preachers of the present day! I would rather a thousand times be five minutes at the feet of Christ than listen a lifetime to all the wise men in the world. He used just to hang truth upon anything. Yonder is a sower, a fox, a bird, and he just gathers the truth round them, so that you can not see a sower, a fox, or a bird without thinking what Jesus said. Yonder is a lily of the valley; you can not see it without thinking of his words, "They toil not, neither do they spin."

He makes the little sparrow chirping in the air preach to us. How fresh those wonderful sermons are; how they live to-day! How we love to tell them to our children; how the children love to hear! "Tell me a story about Jesus,"—how often we hear it; how the little ones love his sermons! No story-book in the world will

ever interest them like the stories that he told. And yet how profound he was; how he puzzled the wise men; how the scribes and the Pharisees could never fathom him! Oh, do you not think he was a wonderful preacher?

If you want to find out what a man is nowadays, you inquire about him from those who know him best. I do not wish to be partial; we will go to his enemies, and to his friends. We will ask them, What think ye of Christ? We will ask his friends and his enemies.

First, among the witnesses, let us call upon the Pharisees. We know how they hated him. Let us put a few questions to them. "Come, Pharisees, tell us what you have against the Son of God. What do you think of Christ?" Hear what they say! "This man receiveth sinners." What an argument to bring against him! Why, it is the very thing that makes us love him. It is the glory of the gospel. He receives sinners. If he had not, what would have become of us? Have you nothing more to bring against him than this? Why, it is one of the greatest compliments that was ever paid him. Once more: "When he was hanging on the tree, you had this to say of him, 'He saved others, but he could not save himself and save us, too.'" So he laid down his own life for yours and mine. Yes, Pharisees, you have told the truth for once in your lives! He saved others. He died for others. He was a ransom for many; so it is quite true

what you think of him—he saved others, himself he can not save.

Now, let us call upon Caiaphas. Let him stand up here in his flowing robes; let us ask him for his evidence. "Caiaphas, you were chief priest when Christ was tried; you were president of the Sanhedrim; you were in the council-chamber when they found him guilty; you yourself condemned him. Tell us; what did the witnesses say? On what grounds did you judge him? What testimony was brought against him?" "He hath spoken blasphemy," says Caiaphas. "He said, 'Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.' When I heard that, I found him guilty of blasphemy; I rent my mantle and condemned him to death." Yes, all that they had against him was that he was the Son of God; and they slew him for the promise of his coming for his bride!

Now let us summon Pilate. Let him enter the witness-box.

"Pilate, this man was brought before you; you examined him; you talked with him face to face; what think you of Christ?"

"I find no fault in him," says Pilate. "He said he was the King of the Jews (just as he wrote it over the cross), but I find no fault in him." Such is the testimony of the man who examined him! And, as he stands there, the center of a Jewish mob, there comes along a man, elbowing his way in haste. He rushes up

to Pilate, and, thrusting out his hand, gives him a message. He tears it open; his face turns pale as he reads, "Have thou nothing to do with this just man, for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him." It is from Pilate's wife—her testimony to Christ. You want to know what his enemies thought of him? You want to know what a heathen thought? Well, here it is: "no fault in him"; and the wife of a heathen: "this just man!"

And now, look—in comes Judas. He ought to make a good witness. Let us address him. "Come, tell us, Judas, what think you of Christ? You knew the master well; you sold him for thirty pieces of silver; you betrayed him with a kiss; you saw him perform those miracles; you were with him in Jerusalem. In Bethany, when he summoned up Lazarus, you were there. What think you of him?" I can see him as he comes into the presence of the chief priests; I can hear the money ring as he dashes it upon the table with, "I have betrayed innocent blood!" Here is the man who betrayed him, and this is what he thinks of him! Yes, those who were guilty of his death put their testimony on record that he was an innocent man.

Let us take the centurion who was present at the execution. He had charge of the Roman soldiers. He had told them to make him carry his cross; he had given orders for the nails to be driven into his feet and hands, for the spear to be thrust in his side. Let the centurion come

forward. "Centurion, you had charge of the executioners; you saw that the order for his death was carried out; you saw him die; you heard him speak upon the cross. Tell us, what think you of Christ?" Hark! Look at him; he is smiting his breast as he cries, "Truly, this was the Son of God!"

I might go to the thief upon the cross, and ask what he thought of him. At first he railed upon him and reviled him. But then he thought better of it. "This man hath done nothing amiss," he says.

I might go further. I might summon the very devils themselves and ask them for their testimony. Have they anything to say of him? Why, the very devils called him the Son of God! In Mark we have the unclean spirit crying, "Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God." Men say, "Oh, I believe Christ to be the Son of God, and because I believe it intellectually I shall be saved." I tell you, the devils did that. And they did more than that; they trembled.

Let us bring in his friends. We want you to hear their evidence. Let us call that prince of preachers. Let us hear the forerunner; none ever preached like this man—this man who drew all Jerusalem and all Judea into the wilderness to hear him; this man who burst upon the nations like the flash of a meteor. Let John the Baptist come with his leathern girdle and his hairy coat, and let him tell us what he thinks of Christ. His words, tho they were echoed in

the wilderness of Palestine, are written in the Book for ever: "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!" This is what John the Baptist thought of him. "I bear record that he is the Son of God." No wonder he drew all Jerusalem and Judea to him, because he preached Christ. And whenever men preach Christ, they are sure to have plenty of followers.

But I shall go still further. I shall go away from earth into the other world. I shall summon the angels and ask what they think of Christ. They saw him in the bosom of the Father before the world was. Before the dawn of creation, before the morning stars sang together, he was there. They saw him leave the throne and come down to the manger. What a scene for them to witness! Ask these heavenly beings what they thought of him then. For once they are permitted to speak; for once the silence of heaven is broken. Listen to their song on the plains of Bethlehem, "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Savior, which is Christ the Lord." He leaves the throne to save the world. Is it a wonder the angels thought well of him?

Then there are the redeemed saints—they that see him face to face. Here on earth he was never known, no one seemed really to be acquainted with him; but he was known in that world where he had been from the foundation. What do they

think of him there? If we could hear from heaven we should hear a shout which would glorify and magnify his name. We are told that when John was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day, and being caught up, he heard a shout around him, ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands and thousands of voices, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing!" Yes, he is worthy of all this. Heaven can not speak too well of him. Oh, that earth would take up the echo and join with heaven in singing, "Worthy to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing!"

But there is still another witness—a higher still. Some think that the God of the Old Testament is the Christ of the New. But when Jesus came out of Jordan, baptized by John, there came a voice from heaven. God the Father spoke. It was his testimony to Christ: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Ah, yes! God the Father thinks well of the Son. And if God is well pleased with him, so ought we. If the sinner and God are well pleased with Christ, then the sinner and God can meet. The moment you say, as the Father said, "I am well pleased with him," and accept him, you are wedded to God. Will you not believe the testimony? Will you not believe this witness, this last of all, the Lord of hosts, the King of kings himself? Once more he repeats it, so that all

may know it. With Peter and James and John, on the mount of transfiguration, he cries again, "This is my beloved Son; hear him." And that voice went echoing and reechoing through Palestine, through all the earth from sea to sea; yes, that voice is echoing still, Hear him! Hear him!

My friend, will you hear him to-day? Hark! what is he saying to you? "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." Will you not think well of such a Savior? Will you not believe in him? Will you not trust in him with all your heart and mind? Will you not live for him? If he laid down his life for us, is it not the least we can do to lay down ours for him? If he bore the Cross and died on it for me, ought I not to be willing to take it up for him? Oh, have we not reason to think well of him? Do you think it is right and noble to lift up your voice against such a Savior? Do you think it is just to cry, "Crucify him! crucify him!" Oh, may God help all of us to glorify the Father, by thinking well of his only-begotten Son.

CONKLING

HIS SPEECH NOMINATING GRANT FOR A THIRD TERM[1]

(1880)

Born in 1829, died in 1888; elected to Congress in 1859, 1861 and 1865; elected to the United States Senate in 1867, serving until 1881, when he resigned in consequence of a dispute with President Garfield; came to New York and began to practise law in 1882.

WHEN asked whence comes our candidate, we say, from Appomattox.[2] Obeying instructions I should never dare to disregard, expressing, also, my own firm conviction, I rise in behalf of the State of New York to propose a nomination with which the country and the Republican party can grandly win. The election before us will be the Austerlitz of American politics. It will decide whether for years to come the country will be "Republican or Cossack." The need of the

[1] Delivered before the National Republican Convention on June 5, 1880, and printed here by kind permission of Alfred R. Conkling, author of "The Life and Letters of Roscoe Conkling."

[2] There was current at this time, among the supporters of Grant for a third term, a bit of campaign doggerel which usually ran as follows—lines which Conkling quoted before he began his speech as an answer to the question: "What State?"

"Do you ask what State he hails from?
Our sole reply shall be:
He hails from Appomattox
And its famous apple tree."

hour is a candidate who can carry the doubtful States, North and South; and, believing that he more surely than any other can carry New York against any opponent, and carry not only the North, but several States of the South, New York is for Ulysses Grant. He alone of living Republicans has carried New York as a presidential candidate. Once he carried it even according to a Democratic count, and twice he carried it by the people's vote, and he is stronger now. The Republican party with its standard in his hand is stronger now than in 1868 or 1872. Never defeated in war or in peace, his name is the most illustrious borne by any living man; his services attest his greatness, and the country knows them by heart. His fame was born not alone of things written and said, but of the arduous greatness of things done; and dangers and emergencies will search in vain in the future, as they have searched in vain in the past, for any other on whom the nation leans with such confidence and trust. Standing on the highest eminence of human distinction, and having filled all lands with his renown; modest, firm, simple, self-poised; he has seen not only the titled but the poor and the lowly in the utmost ends of the world rise and uncover before him. He has studied the needs and defects of many systems of government, and he comes back a better American than ever, with a wealth of knowledge and experience added to the hard common sense which so conspicuously distinguished him

in all the fierce light that beat upon him throughout the most eventful, trying, and perilous sixteen years of the nation's history.

Never having had "a policy to enforce against the will of the people," he never betrayed a cause or a friend, and the people will never betray or desert him. Vilified and reviled, ruthlessly aspersed by numberless presses, not in other lands, but in his own, the assaults upon him have strengthened and seasoned his hold upon the public heart. The ammunition of calumny has all been exploded; the powder has all been burned; its force is spent; and General Grant's name will glitter as a bright and imperishable star in the diadem of the Republic when those who have tried to tarnish it will have moldered in forgotten graves and their memories and epitaphs have vanished utterly.

There is no field of human activity, responsibility, or reason in which rational beings object to Grant, because he has been weighed in the balance and not found wanting, and because he has had unequaled experience, making him exceptionally competent and fit. From the man who shoes your horse to the lawyer who pleads your case, the officer who manages your railway, the doctor into whose hands you give your life, or the minister who seeks to save your soul, whom now do you reject because you have tried him and by his works have known him? What makes the presidential office an exception to all things else in the common sense to be applied to select-

ing its incumbent? Who dares to put fetters on the free choice and judgment, which is the birthright of the American people? Can it be said that Grant used official power to perpetuate his plan? He has no plan. No official power has been used for him. Without patronage or power, without telegraph wires running from his house to the Convention, without electioneering contrivances, without effort on his part, his name is on his country's lips, and he is struck at by the whole Democratic party because his nomination will be the death blow to Democratic success. He is struck at by others who find offense and disqualification in the very service he has rendered and the very experience he has gained. Show me a better man. Name one and I am answered; but do not point, as a disqualification, to the very facts which make this man fit beyond all others. Let not experience disqualify or excellence impeach him. There is no third term in the case, and the pretense will die with the political dog-days which engendered it. Nobody is really worried about a third term except those hopelessly longing for a first term and the dupes they have made. Without bureaus, committees, officials or emissaries to manufacture sentiment in his favor, without intrigue or effort on his part, Grant is the candidate whose supporters have never threatened to bolt. As they say, he is a Republican who never wavers. He and his friends stood by the creed and the candidates of the Republican party, holding the

right of a majority as the very essence of their faith, and meaning to uphold that faith against the common enemy and the charlatans and the guerrillas who from time to time deploy between the lines and forage on one side or the other.

GARFIELD

HIS SPEECH NOMINATING SHERMAN FOR PRESIDENT[1]

(1880)

Born in 1831, died in 1881; President of Hiram College (Ohio), 1859–61; promoted to be Brigadier-General of Volunteers in the Civil War, 1862; Major-General in 1863; elected to Congress from Ohio in 1863, serving until 1880; Member of the Electoral Commission of 1877; elected United States Senator from Ohio in 1880; elected President in 1880; shot by an assassin on July 2, 1881, and died September 19.

I HAVE witnessed the extraordinary scenes of this Convention with deep solicitude. Nothing touches my heart more quickly than a tribute of honor to a great and noble character; but as I sat in my seat and witnessed this demonstration, this assemblage seemed to me a human ocean in tempest. I have seen the sea lashed into fury and tossed into spray, and its grandeur moves

[1] Delivered in the Republican National Convention at Chicago, June 5, 1880, immediately after the speech of Roscoe Conkling, nominating General Grant for a third term. See Hinsdale's "The Works of James A. Garfield," 2 volumes, Boston, 1882. This speech made a deep impression, and has since been generally cited as the immediate cause of Garfield's own nomination a few days later. The correspondent of the New York *Times*, writing on the day following the delivery of the speech, said:

"Curious remarks were made about it. Those who were utterly unable to recognize the secretary of the treasury in the ideal man whose portrait Garfield drew, begin to think that the picture was Garfield's picture of himself. Suggestions to this effect have been frequently made to-day by men who are in no way hostile to Garfield, and who see in the course he has pursued during the Convention indications of an honest desire to advance his own fortunes."

the soul of the dullest man; but I remember that it is not the billows, but the calm level of the sea, from which all heights and depths are measured. When the storm has passed and the hour of calm settles on the ocean, when the sunlight bathes its peaceful surface, then the astronomer and surveyor take the level from which they measure all terrestrial heights and depths.

Gentlemen of the Convention, your present temper may not mark the healthful pulse of our people. When your enthusiasm has passed, when the emotions of this hour have subsided, we shall find below the storm and passion that calm level of public opinion from which the thoughts of a mighty people are to be measured, and by which final action will be determined.

Not here, in this brilliant circle, where fifteen thousand men and women are gathered, is the destiny of the Republic to be decreed for the next four years. Not here, where I see the enthusiastic faces of seven hundred and fifty-six delegates, waiting to cast their lots into the urn and determine the choice of the Republic, but by four millions of Republican firesides, where the thoughtful voters, with wives and children about them, with the calm thoughts inspired by love of home and country, with the history of the past, the hopes of the future, and reverence for the great men who have adorned and blessed our nation in days gone by, burning in their hearts,—there God prepares the verdict which will determine the wisdom of our work

to-night. Not in Chicago, in the heat of June, but at the ballot-boxes of the Republic, in the quiet of November, after the silence of deliberate judgment, will this question be settled. And now, gentlemen of the Convention, what do we want?[1]

Bear with me a moment. "Hear me for my cause," and for a moment "be silent that you may hear."

Twenty-five years ago this Republic was bearing and wearing a triple chain of bondage. Long familiarity with traffic in the bodies and souls of men had paralyzed the consciences of a majority of our people; the narrowing and disintegrating doctrine of State sovereignty had shackled and weakened the noblest and most beneficent powers of the national government; and the grasping power of slavery was seizing upon the virgin territories of the West, and dragging them into the den of eternal bondage.

At that crisis the Republican party was born. It drew its first inspiration from that fire of liberty which God has lighted in every human heart, and which all the powers of ignorance and tyranny can never wholly extinguish. The Republican party came to deliver and to save. It entered the arena where the beleaguered and assailed Territories were struggling for freedom, and drew around them the sacred circle of liberty, which the demon of slavery has never dared

[1] At this point a voice called out: "We want Garfield."

to cross. It made them free for ever. Strengthened by its victory on the frontier, the young party, under the leadership of that great man who on this spot,[1] twenty years ago, was made its chief, entered the national Capitol, and assumed the high duties of government. The light which shone from its banner illumined its pathway to power. Every slave-pen and the shackles of every slave within the shadow of the Capitol were consumed in the rekindled fire of freedom.

Our great national industries by cruel and calculating neglect had been prostrated, and the streams of revenue flowed in such feeble currents that the treasury itself was well-nigh empty. The money of the people consisted mainly of the wretched notes of two thousand uncontrolled and irresponsible State banking corporations, which were filling the country with a circulation that poisoned, rather than sustained, the life of business.

The Republican party changed all this. It abolished the Babel of confusion, and gave to the country a currency as national as its flag, based upon the sacred faith of the people. It threw its protecting arm around our great industries, and they stood erect with new life. It filled with the spirit of true nationality all the great functions of the government. It confronted a rebellion of unexampled magnitude, with slavery behind it, and, under God, fought

[1] Lincoln was nominated for president in Chicago.

the final battle of liberty until the victory was won.

Then, after the storms of battle, were heard the calm words of peace spoken by the conquering nation, saying to the foe that lay prostrate at its feet: "This is our only revenge—that you join us in lifting into the serene firmament of the Constitution, to shine like stars for ever and ever, the immortal principles of truth and justice: that all men, white or black, shall be free, and shall stand equal before the law."

Then came the questions of reconstruction, the national debt, and the keeping of the public faith. In the settlement of these questions, the Republican party has completed its twenty-five years of glorious existence and it has sent us here to prepare it for another lustrum of duty and of victory. How shall we accomplish this great work? We can not do it, my friends, by assailing our Republican brethren. God forbid that I should say one word, or cast one shadow, upon any name on the roll of our heroes. The coming fight is our Thermopylæ. We are standing upon a narrow isthmus. If our Spartan hosts are united, we can withstand all the Persians that the Xerxes of Democracy can bring against us. Let us hold our ground this one year, and then "the stars in their courses" will fight for us. The census will bring reinforcements and continued power.

But in order to win victory now, we want the vote of every Republican—of every Grant Re-

publican, and every anti-Grant Republican, in America—of every Blaine man and every anti-Blaine man. The vote of every follower of every candidate is needed to make success certain. Therefore I say, gentlemen and brethren, we are here to take calm counsel together, and inquire what we shall do.

We want a man whose life and opinions embody all the achievements of which I have spoken. We want a man who, standing on a mountain height, traces the victorious footsteps of our party in the past, and, carrying in his heart the memory of its glorious deeds, looks forward prepared to meet the dangers to come. We want one who will act in no spirit of unkindness toward those we lately met in battle. The Republican party offers to our brethren of the South the olive-branch of peace, and invites them to renewed brotherhood on this supreme condition—that it shall be admitted for ever, that in the war for the Union we were right and they were wrong. On that supreme condition we meet them as brethren, and ask them to share with us the blessings and honors of this great Republic.

Now, gentlemen, not to weary you, I am about to present a name for your consideration, —the name of one who was the comrade, associate, and friend of nearly all the noble dead, whose faces look down upon us from these walls to-night[1]; a man who began his career of public

[1] A reference to the portraits of Lincoln, Sumner, Wade, Chandler and others, which were hanging in the Convention hall.

service twenty-five years ago,—who courageously confronted the slave power in the days of peril on the plains of Kansas, when first began to fall the red drops of that bloody shower which finally swelled into the deluge of gore in the late Rebellion. He bravely stood by young Kansas, and, returning to his seat in the national Legislature, his pathway through all the subsequent years has been marked by labors worthily performed in every department of legislation.

You ask for his monument. I point you to twenty-five years of national statutes. Not one great, beneficent law has been placed on our statute-books without his intelligent and powerful aid. He aided in formulating the laws to raise the great armies and navies which carried us through the war. His hand was seen in the workmanship of those statutes that restored and brought back "the unity and married calm of States." His hand was in all that great legislation that created the war currency, and in all the still greater work that redeemed the promises of the government and made the currency equal to gold.

When at last he passed from the halls of legislation into a high executive office, he displayed that experience, intelligence, firmness, and poise of character, which have carried us through a stormy period of three years, with one-half the public Press crying "Crucify him!" and a hostile Congress seeking to prevent success. In all this he remained unmoved until victory crowned

him. The great fiscal affairs of the nation, and the vast business interests of the country, he guarded and preserved while executing the law of resumption, and effected its object without a jar and against the false prophecies of one-half of the Press and of all the Democratic party.

He has shown himself able to meet with calmness the great emergencies of the government. For twenty-five years he has trodden the perilous heights of public duty, and against all the shafts of malice has borne his breast unharmed. He has stood in the blaze of "that fierce light that beats against the throne"; but its fiercest ray has found no flaw in his armor, no stain upon his shield. I do not present him as a better Republican or a better man than thousands of others that we honor; but I present him for your deliberate and favorable consideration. I nominate John Sherman, of Ohio.

GRANT

REASONS FOR BEING A REPUBLICAN[1]

(1880)

Born in 1822, died in 1885; graduated from West Point in 1843; served in the Mexican War in 1846–48; a Colonel in the Civil War in June, 1861; a Brigadier-General in August, 1861; a Major-General of Volunteers in 1862; Commander of the Army of West Tennessee in 1862; made Lieutenant-General on March 2, 1864; Commander of all the Union armies, March 12, 1864; received Lee's surrender at Appomattox on April 9, 1865; made General, July 25, 1866; Secretary of War in 1867; elected President in 1868 and reelected in 1872; an unsuccessful candidate for renomination in 1880.

In view of the known character of the speaker who is to address you to-day, and his long public career, and association with the leading statesmen of this country for the past twenty years, it would not be becoming in me to detain you with many remarks of my own. But it may be proper for me to account to you on the first occasion of my presiding at political meetings for the faith that is in me.

I am a Republican, as the two great political parties are now divided, because the Republican party is a national party seeking the greatest

[1] One of the few speeches made by General Grant after he retired from public life. It was delivered at Warren, Ohio, on September 23, 1880. He was then presiding at a Republican mass-meeting, and made this speech before introducing the orator of the day, Roscoe Conkling, who, on June 5 of the same year, had made the speech nominating him (Grant) for a third term.

good for the greatest number of citizens. There is not a precinct in this vast nation where a Democrat can not cast his ballot and have it counted as cast. No matter what the prominence of the opposite party, he can proclaim his political opinions, even if he is only one among a thousand, without fear and without proscription on account of his opinions. There are fourteen States, and localities in some other States, where Republicans have not this privilege. This is one reason why I am a Republican.

But I am a Republican for many other reasons. The Republican party assures protection to life and property, the public credit, and the payment of the debts of the government, State, county, or municipality, so far as it can control. The Democratic party does not promise this; if it does, it has broken its promises to the extent of hundreds of millions, as many Northern Democrats can testify to their sorrow. I am a Republican, as between the existing parties, because it fosters the production of the field and farm, and of manufactories, and it encourages the general education of the poor as well as the rich.

The Democratic party discourages all these when in absolute power. The Republican party is a party of progress, and of liberty toward its opponents. It encourages the poor to strive to better their children, to enable them to compete successfully with their more fortunate associates, and, in fine, it secures an entire equality before the law of every citizen, no matter what his

race, nationality, or previous condition. It tolerates no privileged class. Every one has the opportunity to make himself all he is capable of.

Ladies and gentlemen, do you believe this can be truthfully said in the greater part of fourteen of the States of this Union to-day which the Democratic party control absolutely? The Republican party is a party of principles; the same principles prevailing wherever it has a foothold.

The Democratic party is united in but one thing, and that is in getting control of the government in all its branches. It is for internal improvement at the expense of the government in one section and against this in another. It favors repudiation of solemn obligations in one section and honest payment of its debts in another, where public opinion will not tolerate any other view. It favors fiat money in one place and good money in another. Finally, it favors the pooling of all issues not favored by the Republicans, to the end that it may secure the one principle upon which the party is a most harmonious unit—namely, getting control of the government in all its branches.

I have been in some part of every State lately in rebellion within the last year. I was most hospitably received at every place where I stopped. My receptions were not by the Union class alone, but by all classes, without distinction. I had a free talk with many who were against me in war, and who have been against the Re-

publican party ever since. They were, in all instances, reasonable men, judging by what they said. I believed then, and believe now, that they sincerly want a break-up in this "Solid South" political condition. They see that it is to their pecuniary interest, as well as to their happiness, that there should be harmony and confidence between all sections. They want to break away from the slavery which binds them to a party name. They want a pretext that enough of them can unite upon to make it respectable. Once started, the Solid South will go as Kukluxism did before, as is so admirably told by Judge Tourgee in his "Fool's Errand." When the break comes, those who start it will be astonished to find how many of their friends have been in favor of it for a long time, and have only been waiting to see some one take the lead. This desirable solution can only be attained by the defeat, and continued defeat, of the Democratic party as now constituted.

BLAINE

ON THE DEATH OF GARFIELD[1]

(1882)

Born in 1830, died in 1893; elected to Congress in 1863, serving until 1876; Speaker of the House from 1869 to 1875; Senator from Maine in 1876–81; Secretary of State in 1881 and again in 1889; unsuccessful candidate for President in 1884.

For the second time in this generation the great departments of the government of the United States are assembled in the Hall of Representatives, to do honor to the memory of a murdered president. Lincoln fell at the close of a mighty struggle, in which the passions of men had been deeply stirred. The tragical termination of his great life added but another to the lengthened succession of horrors which had marked so many lintels with the blood of the firstborn. Garfield was slain in a day of peace, when brother had been reconciled to brother, and when anger and hate had been banished from the land.

From the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth till the uprising against Charles I., about twenty thousand emigrants came from old England to New England. As they came in pursuit of intel-

[1] Delivered in the House of Representatives, February 27, 1882. Abridged.

lectual freedom and ecclesiastical independence, rather than from worldly honor and profit, the emigration naturally ceased when the contest for religious liberty began in earnest at home. The man who struck his most effective blow for freedom of conscience, by sailing for the Colonies in 1620, would have been accounted a deserter to leave after 1640. The opportunity had then come on the soil of England for that great contest which established the authority of Parliament, gave religious freedom to the people, sent Charles to the block, and committed to the hands of Oliver Cromwell the supreme executive authority of England. The English emigration was never renewed, and from these twenty thousand men, with a small emigration from Scotland and from France, are descended the vast numbers who have New England blood in their veins.

In 1685 the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV., scattered to other countries four hundred thousand Protestants, who were among the most intelligent and enterprising of French subjects—merchants of capital, skilled manufacturers, and handicraftsmen superior at the time to all others in Europe. A considerable number of these Huguenot French came to America; a few landed in New England and became honorably prominent in its history. Their names have in large part become Anglicized, or have disappeared, but their blood is traceable in many of the most reputable families and their fame is

perpetuated in honorable memorials and useful institutions.

From these two sources, the English-Puritan and the French-Huguenot, came the late president—his father, Abram Garfield, descended from the one, and his mother, Eliza Ballou, from the other.

It was good stock on both sides—none better, none braver, none truer. There was in it an inheritance of courage, of manliness, of imperishable love of liberty, of undying adherence to principle. Garfield was proud of his blood; and, with as much satisfaction as if he were a British nobleman reading his stately ancestral record in Burke's "Peerage," he spoke of himself as ninth in descent from those who would not endure the oppression of the Stuarts, and seventh in descent from the brave French Protestants who refused to submit to tyranny even from the Grand Monarch.

General Garfield delighted to dwell on these traits, and during his only visit to England he busied himself in discovering every trace of his forefathers in parish registers and on ancient army rolls. Sitting with a friend in the gallery of the House of Commons one night after a long day's labor in this field of research, he said with evident elation that in every war in which for three centuries patriots of English blood had struck sturdy blows for constitutional government and human liberty, his family had been represented. They were at Marston Moor, at

Naseby, and at Preston; they were at Bunker Hill, at Saratoga, and at Monmouth; and in his own person had battled for the same great cause in the war which preserved the Union of the States.

The poverty of the frontier, where all are engaged in a common struggle, and where a common sympathy and hearty cooperation lighten the burdens of each, is a very different poverty—different in kind, different in influence and effect—from that conscious and humiliating indigence which is every day forced to contrast itself with neighboring wealth on which it feels a sense of grinding dependence. The poverty of the frontier is, indeed, no poverty. It is but the beginning of wealth, and has the boundless possibilities of the future always opening before it. No man ever grew up in the agricultural regions of the West, where a house-raising, or even a corn-husking is a matter of common interest and helpfulness, with any other feeling than that of broad-minded, generous independence. This honorable independence marked the youth of Garfield as it marks the youth of millions of the best blood and brain now training for the future citizenship and future government of the Republic. Garfield was born heir to land, to the title of freeholder which has been the patent and passport of self-respect with the Anglo-Saxon race ever since Hengist and Horsa landed on the shores of England. His adventure on the canal —an alternative between that and the deck of

a Lake Erie schooner—was a farmer boy's device for earning money, just as the New England lad begins a possibly great career by sailing before the mast on a coasting vessel or on a merchantman bound to the Farther India or to the China Seas.

No manly man feels anything of shame in looking back to early struggles with adverse circumstances, and no man feels a worthier pride than when he has conquered the obstacles to his progress. But no one of noble mold desires to be looked upon as having occupied a menial position, as having been repressed by a feeling of inferiority, or as having suffered the evils of poverty until relief was found at the hand of charity. General Garfield's youth presented no hardships which family love and family energy did not overcome, subjected him to no privations which he did not cheerfully accept, and left no memories save those which were recalled with delight, and transmitted with profit and with pride.

With possibly a single exception, Garfield was the youngest member in the House when he entered, and was but seven years from his college graduation. But he had not been in his seat sixty days before his ability was recognized and his place conceded. He stepped to the front with the confidence of one who belonged there. The House was crowded with strong men of both parties; nineteen of them have since been transferred to the Senate, and many of them have served with distinction in the gubernatorial

chairs of their respective States and on foreign missions of great consequence; but among them all none grew so rapidly, none so firmly, as Garfield. As is said by Trevelyan of his parliamentary hero, Garfield succeeded "because all the world in concert could not have kept him in the background, and because when once in the front he played his part with a prompt intrepidity and a commanding ease that were but the outward symptoms of the immense reserves of energy on which it was in his power to draw." Indeed, the apparently reserved force which Garfield possessed was one of his great characteristics. He never did so well but that it seemed he could easily have done better. He never expended so much strength but that he seemed to be holding additional power to call. This is one of the happiest and rarest distinctions of an effective debater, and often counts for as much in persuading an assembly as the eloquent and elaborate argument.

The great measure of Garfield's fame was filled by his service in the House of Representatives. His military life, illustrated by honorable performance, and rich in promise, was, as he himself felt, prematurely terminated and necessarily incomplete. Speculation as to what he might have done in the field, where the great prizes are so few, can not be profitable. It is sufficient to say that as a soldier he did his duty bravely; he did it intelligently; he won an enviable fame, and he retired from the service with-

out blot or breath against him. As a lawyer, tho admirably equipped for the profession, he can scarcely be said to have entered on its practise. The few efforts that he made at the bar were distinguished by the same high order of talent which he exhibited on every field where he was put to test, and if a man may be accepted as a competent judge of his own capacities and adaptation, the law was the profession to which Garfield should have devoted himself. But fate ordained it otherwise, and his reputation in history will rest largely upon his services in the House of Representatives. That service was exceptionally long. He was nine times consecutively chosen to the House, an honor enjoyed by not more than six other representatives of the more than five thousand who have been elected from the organization of the government to this hour.

As a parliamentary orator, as a debater on an issue squarely joined, where the position had been chosen and the ground laid out, Garfield must be assigned a very high rank. More, perhaps, than any man with whom he was associated in public life he gave careful and systematic study to public questions, and he came to every discussion in which he took part with elaborate and complete preparation. He was a steady and indefatigable worker. Those who imagine that talent or genius can supply the place or achieve the results of labor will find no encouragement in Garfield's life. In preliminary work he was apt, rapid, and skilful. He possessed in a high

degree the power of readily absorbing ideas and facts, and, like Doctor Johnson, had the art of getting from a book all that was of value in it by a reading apparently so quick and cursory that it seemed like a mere glance at the table of contents. He was a preeminently fair and candid man in debate, took no petty advantage, stooped to no unworthy methods, avoided personal allusions, rarely appealed to prejudice, did not seek to inflame passion. He had a quicker eye for the strong point of his adversary than for his weak point, and on his own side he so marshaled his weighty arguments as to make his hearers forget any possible lack in the complete strength of his position. He had a habit of stating his opponent's side with such amplitude of fairness and such liberality of concession that his followers often complained that he was giving his case away. But never in his prolonged participation in the proceedings of the House did he give his case away, or fail in the judgment of competent and impartial listeners to gain the mastery.

These characteristics, which marked Garfield as a great debater, did not, however, make him a great parliamentary leader. A parliamentary leader, as that term is understood wherever free representative government exists, is necessarily and very strictly the organ of his party. An ardent American defined the instinctive warmth of patriotism when he offered the toast, "Our country always right; but, right or wrong, our country." The parliamentary leader who has a

body of followers that will do and dare and die for the cause is one who believes his party always right, but, right or wrong, is for his party. No more important or exacting duty devolves upon him than the selection of the field and the time of the contest. He must know not merely how to strike, but where to strike and when to strike. He often skilfully avoids the strength of his opponent's position and scatters confusion in his ranks by attacking an exposed point, when really the righteousness of the cause and the strength of logical intrenchment are against him. He conquers often both against the right and the heavy battalions; as when young Charles Fox, in the days of his Toryism, carried the House of Commons against justice, against immemorial rights, against his own convictions—if, indeed, at that period, Fox had convictions—and in the interest of a corrupt administration, in obedience to a tyrannical sovereign, drove Wilkes from the seat to which the electors of Middlesex had chosen him and installed Luttrell, in defiance, not merely of law, but of public decency. For an achievement of that kind Garfield was disqualified—disqualified by the texture of his mind, by the honesty of his heart, by his conscience, and by every instinct and aspiration of his nature.

The three most distinguished parliamentary leaders hitherto developed in this country are Mr. Clay, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. Thaddeus Stevens. Each was a man of consummate ability,

of great earnestness, of intense personality differing widely each from the others, and yet with a signal trait in common—the power to command. In the "give and take" of daily discussion; in the art of controlling and consolidating reluctant and refractory followers; in the skill to overcome all forms of opposition, and to meet with competency and courage the varying phases of unlooked-for assault or unsuspected defection, it would be difficult to rank with these a fourth name in all our Congressional history. But of these Mr. Clay was the greatest.

It would, perhaps, be impossible to find in the parliamentary annals of the world a parallel to Mr. Clay, in 1841, when at sixty-four years of age he took the control of the Whig party from the president who had received their suffrages, against the power of Webster in the Cabinet, against the eloquence of Choate in the Senate, against the herculean efforts of Caleb Cushing and Henry A. Wise in the House. In unshared leadership, in the pride and plentitude of power he hurled against John Tyler with deepest scorn the mass of that conquering column which had swept over the land in 1840, and drove his administration to seek shelter behind the lines of his political foes. Mr. Douglas achieved a victory scarcely less wonderful when, in 1854, against the secret desires of a strong administration, against the wise counsel of the older chiefs, against the conservative instincts and even the moral sense of the country, he

forced a reluctant Congress into a repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, in his contests from 1865 to 1868, actually advanced his parliamentary leadership until Congress tied the hands of the president and governed the country by its own will, leaving only perfunctory duties to be discharged by the executive. With two hundred millions of patronage in his hands at the opening of the contest, aided by the active force of Seward in the cabinet, and the moral power of Chase on the bench, Andrew Johnson could not command the support of one-third in either House against the parliamentary uprising of which Thaddeus Stevens was the animating spirit and the unquestioned leader.

From these three great men Garfield differed radically; differed in the quality of his mind, in temperament, in the form and phase of ambition. He could not do what they did, but he could do what they could not, and in the breadth of his Congressional work he left that which will longer exert a potential influence among men, and which, measured by the severe test of posthumous criticism, will secure a more enduring and more enviable fame.

Those unfamiliar with Garfield's industry, and ignorant of the details of his work, may in some degree measure them by the annals of Congress. No one of the generation of public men to which he belonged has contributed so much that will be valuable for future reference. His

speeches are numerous, many of them brilliant, all of them well studied, carefully phrased, and exhaustive of the subject under consideration. Collected from the scattered pages of ninety royal octavo volumes of the Congressional Record, they would present an invaluable compendium of the political history of the most important era through which the national government has ever passed.

Differing, as Garfield does, from the brilliant parliamentary leaders, it is not easy to find his counterpart anywhere in the record of American public life. He perhaps more nearly resembles Mr. Seward in his supreme faith in the all-conquering power of a principle. He had the love of learning and the patient industry of investigation to which John Quincy Adams owes his prominence and his presidency. He had some of those ponderous elements of mind which distinguished Mr. Webster, and which indeed, in all our public life, have left the great Massachusetts senator without an intellectual peer.

In English parliamentary history, as in our own, the leaders in the House of Commons present points of essential difference from Garfield. But some of his methods recall the best features in the strong, independent course of Sir Robert Peel, and striking resemblances are discernible in that most promising of modern Conservatives, who died too early for his country and his fame, Lord George Bentinck. He had all of Burke's love for the sublime and the beautiful, with, pos-

sibly, something of his superabundance, and in his faith and his magnanimity, in his power of statement, in his subtle analysis, in his faultless logic, in his love of literature, in his wealth and world of illustration, one is reminded of that great English statesman of to-day, who, confronted with obstacles that would daunt any but the dauntless, reviled by those whom he would relieve as bitterly as by those whose supposed rights he is forced to invade, still labors with serene courage for the amelioration of Ireland and for the honor of the English name.

Garfield's nomination to the presidency, while not predicted or anticipated, was not a surprise to the country. His prominence in Congress, his solid qualities, his wide reputation, strengthened by his then recent election as senator from Ohio, kept him in the public eye as a man occupying the very highest rank among those entitled to be called statesman. It was not mere chance that brought him this high honor. "We must," says Mr. Emerson, "reckon success a constitutional trait. If Eric is in robust health, and has slept well and is at the top of his condition, and thirty years old at his departure from Greenland, he will steer west and his ships will reach Newfoundland. But take Eric out and put in a stronger and bolder man and the ships will sail six hundred, one thousand, fifteen hundred miles farther and reach Labrador and New England. There is no chance in results."

In the beginning of his presidential life Gar-

field's experience did not yield him pleasure or satisfaction. The duties that engross so large a portion of the president's time were distasteful to him, and were unfavorably contrasted with his legislative work. "I have been dealing all these years with ideas," he impatiently exclaimed one day, "and here I am dealing only with persons. I have been heretofore treating of the fundamental principles of government, and here I am considering all day whether A or B shall be appointed to this or that office." He was earnestly seeking some practical way of correcting the evils arising from the distribution of overgrown and unwieldy patronage—evils always appreciated and often discussed by him, but whose magnitude had been more deeply impressed upon his mind since his accession to the presidency. Had he lived, a comprehensive improvement in the mode of appointment and in the tenure of office would have been proposed by him, and, with the aid of Congress, no doubt perfected.

But, while many of the executive duties were not grateful to him, he was assiduous and conscientious in their discharge. From the very outset he exhibited administrative talent of a high order. He grasped the helm of office with the hand of a master. In this respect, indeed, he constantly surprised many who were most intimately associated with him in the government, and especially those who had feared that he might be lacking in the executive faculty. His

disposition of business was orderly and rapid. His power of analysis and his skill in classification enabled him to despatch a vast mass of detail with singular promptness and ease. His cabinet meetings were admirably conducted. His clear presentation of official subjects, his well-considered suggestion of topics on which discussion was invited, his quick decision when all had been heard, combined to show a thoroughness of mental training as rare as his natural ability and his facile adaptation to a new and enlarged field of labor.

Garfield's ambition for the success of his administration was high. With strong caution and conservatism in his nature, he was in no danger of attempting rash experiments or of resorting to the empiricism of statesmanship. But he believed that renewed and closer attention should be given to questions affecting the material interests and commercial prospects of fifty millions of people. He believed that our continental relations, extensive and undeveloped as they are, involved responsibility and could be cultivated into profitable friendship or be abandoned to harmful indifference or lasting enmity. He believed with equal confidence that an essential forerunner to a new era of national progress must be a feeling of contentment in every section of the Union and a generous belief that the benefits and burdens of government would be common to all.

The political events which disturbed the pres-

ident's serenity for many weeks before that fatal day in July, form an important chapter in his career, and, in his own judgment, involved questions of principle and right which are vitally essential to the constitutional administration of the federal government. It would be out of place here and now to speak the language of controversy, but the events referred to, however they may continue to be a source of contention with others, have become, as far as Garfield is concerned, as much a matter of history as his heroism at Chickamauga or his illustrious service in the House. Detail is not needful, and personal antagonism shall not be rekindled by any word uttered to-day. The motives of those opposing him are not to be here adversely interpreted nor their course harshly characterized. But of the dead president this is to be said, and said because his own speech is for ever silenced and he can be no more heard except through the fidelity and the love of surviving friends: From the beginning to the end of the controversy he so much deplored, the president was never for one moment actuated by any motive of gain to himself or of loss to others. Least of all men did he harbor revenge, rarely did he even show resentment, and malice was not in his nature. He was congenially employed only in the exchange of good offices and the doing of kindly deeds.

There was not an hour, from the beginning of the trouble till the fatal shot entered his body,

when the president would not gladly, for the sake of restoring harmony, have retracted any step he had taken if such retracting had merely involved consequences personal to himself. The pride of consistency, or any supposed sense of humiliation that might result from surrendering his position, had not a feather's weight with him. No man was ever less subject to such influences from within or from without. But after the most anxious deliberation and the coolest survey of all the circumstances, he solemnly believed that the true prerogatives of the executive were involved in the issue which had been raised and that he would be unfaithful to his supreme obligation if he failed to maintain, in all their vigor, the constitutional rights and dignities of his great office. He believed this in all the convictions of conscience when in sound and vigorous health, and he believed it in his suffering and prostration in the last conscious thought which his wearied mind bestowed on the transitory struggles of life.

More than this need not be said. Less than this could not be said. Justice to the dead, the highest obligation that devolves upon the living, demands the declaration that in all the bearings of the subject, actual or possible, the president was content in his mind, justified in his conscience, immovable in his conclusions.

Great in life, he was surpassingly great in death. For no cause, in the very frenzy of wantonness and wickedness, by the red hand of

murder, he was thrust from the full tide of this world's interest, from its hopes, its aspirations, its victories, into the visible presence of death—and he did not quail. Not alone for one short moment in which, stunned and dazed, he could give up life, hardly aware of its relinquishment, but through days of deadly languor, through weeks of agony, that was not less agony because silently borne, with clear sight and calm courage he looked into his open grave. What blight and ruin met his anguished eyes, whose lips may tell—what brilliant, broken plans, what baffled, high ambitions, what sundering of strong, warm, manhood's friendship, what bitter rending of sweet household ties! Behind him a proud, expectant nation, a great host of sustaining friends, a cherished and happy mother, wearing the full, rich honors of her early toil and tears; the wife of his youth, whose whole life lay in his; the little boys not yet emerged from childhood's day of frolic; the fair young daughter; the sturdy sons just springing into closest companionship, claiming every day and every day rewarding a father's love and care; and in his heart the eager, rejoicing power to meet all demands. And his soul was not shaken. His countrymen were thrilled with instant, profound, and universal sympathy. Masterful in his mortal weakness, he became the center of a nation's love, enshrined in the prayers of a world. But all the love and all the sympathy could not share with him his suffering. He trod the wine-press alone.

With unfaltering front he faced death. With unfailing tenderness he took leave of life. Above the demoniac hiss of the assassin's bullet he heard the voice of God. With simple resignation he bowed to the Divine decree.

As the end drew near his early craving for the sea returned. The stately mansion of power had been to him the wearisome hospital of pain, and he begged to be taken from his prison walls, from its oppressive, stifling air, from its homelessness and its hopelessness. Gently, silently, the love of a great people bore the pale sufferer to the longed-for healing of the sea, to live or to die, as God should will, within sight of the heaving billows, within sound of its manifold voices. With a wan, fevered face, tenderly lifted to the cooling breeze, he looked out wistfully upon the ocean's changing wonders; on its far sails; on its restless waves, rolling shoreward to break and die beneath the noonday sun; on the red clouds of evening, arching low to the horizon; on the serene and shining pathway of the star. Let us think that his dying eyes read a mystic meaning which only the rapt and parting soul may know. Let us believe that in the silence of the receding world he heard the great waves breaking on a further shore and felt already upon his wasted brow the breath of the eternal morning.

CLEVELAND

I

HIS FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS[1]

(1885)

Born in 1837; elected Mayor of Buffalo in 1882; Governor of New York in 1883–84; elected President in 1884; defeated for President in 1888; reelected President in 1892; called an extra session of Congress which repealed the purchasing clause of the Sherman Silve Bill in 1893.

In the presence of this vast assemblage of my countrymen, I am about to supplement and seal by the oath which I shall take, the manifestation of the will of a great and free people. In the exercise of their power and right of self-government they have committed to one of their fellow citizens a supreme and sacred trust, and he here consecrates himself to their service.

This impressive ceremony adds little to the solemn sense of responsibility with which I contemplate the duty I owe to all the people of the land. Nothing can relieve me from anxiety lest by any act of mine their interests may suffer, and nothing is needed to strengthen my resolution to engage every faculty and effort in the promotion of their welfare.

Amid the din of party strife the people's

[1] Delivered March 4, 1885, and included in this edition by Mr. Cleveland's kind permission.

choice was made, but its attendant circumstances have demonstrated anew the strength and safety of a government by the people. In each succeeding year it more clearly appears that our democratic principle needs no apology, and that in its fearless and faithful application is to be found the surest guarantee of good government.

But the best results in the operation of a government wherein every citizen has a share, largely depend upon a proper limitation of purely partizan zeal and effort and a correct appreciation of the time when the heat of the partizan should be merged in the patriotism of the citizen.

To-day the executive branch of the government is transferred to new keeping. But this is still the government of all the people, and it should be none the less an object of their affectionate solicitude. At this hour the animosities of political strife, the bitterness of partizan defeat, and the exultation of partizan triumph, should be supplanted by an ungrudging acquiescence in the popular will, and a sober, conscientious concern for the general weal. Moreover, if from this hour we cheerfully and honestly abandon all sectional prejudice and distrust, and determine, with manly confidence in one another, to work out harmoniously the achievement of our national destiny, we shall deserve to realize all the benefits which our happy form of government can bestow.

On this auspicious occasion we may well re-

new the pledge of our devotion to the Constitution, which, launched by the founders of the Republic and consecrated by their prayers and patriotic devotion, has for almost a century borne the hopes and the aspirations of a great people through prosperity and peace and through the shock of foreign conflicts and the perils of domestic strife and vicissitudes.

By the Father of his Country our Constitution was commended for adoption as "the result of a spirit of amity and mutual concession." In that same spirit it should be administered, in order to promote the lasting welfare of the country and to secure the full measure of its priceless benefits to us and to those who will succeed to the blessings of our national life. The large variety of diverse and competing interests subject to Federal control, persistently seeking the recognition of their claims, need give us no fear that "the greatest good to the greatest number" will fail to be accomplished if in the halls of national legislation that spirit of amity and mutual concession shall prevail in which the Constitution had its birth. If this involves the surrender or postponement of private interests and the abandonment of local advantages, compensation will be found in the assurance that the common interest is subserved and the general welfare advanced.

In the discharge of my official duty I shall endeavor to be guided by a just and unstrained construction of the Constitution, a careful ob-

servance of the distinction between the powers granted to the federal government and those reserved to the States or to the people, and by a cautious appreciation of those functions which by the Constitution and laws have been especially assigned to the executive branch of the government.

But he who takes the oath to-day to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States only assumes the solemn obligation which every patriotic citizen—on the farm, in the workshop, in the busy marts of trade, and everywhere—should share with him. The Constitution which prescribes his oath, my countrymen, is yours; the government you have chosen him to administer for a time is yours; the suffrage which executes the will of freemen is yours; the laws and the entire scheme of our civil rule, from the town meeting to the State capitals and the national capital, is yours. Your every voter, as surely as your chief magistrate, under the same high sanction, tho in a different sphere, exercises a public trust. Nor is this all. Every citizen owes to the country a vigilant watch and close scrutiny of its public servants and a fair and reasonable estimate of their fidelity and usefulness. Thus is the people's will impressed upon the whole framework of our civil polity—municipal, State, and federal; and this is the price of our liberty and the inspiration of our faith in the Republic.

It is the duty of those serving the people in

public place to closely limit public expenditures to the actual needs of the government, economically administered, because this bounds the right of the government to exact tribute from the earnings of labor or the property of the citizen, and because public extravagance begets extravagance among the people. We should never be ashamed of the simplicity and prudential economies which are best suited to the operation of a republican form of government and most compatible with the mission of the American people. Those who are selected for a limited time to manage public affairs are still of the people, and may do much by their example to encourage, consistently with the dignity of their official functions, that plain way of life which among their fellow citizens aids integrity and promotes thrift and prosperity.

The genius of our institutions, the needs of our people in their home life, and the attention which is demanded for the settlement and development of the resources of our vast territory, dictate the scrupulous avoidance of any departure from that foreign policy commended by the history, the traditions, and the prosperity of our Republic. It is the policy of independence, favored by our position and defended by our known love of justice and by our own power. It is the policy of peace suitable to our interests. It is the policy of neutrality, rejecting any share in foreign broils and ambitions upon other continents and repelling their intrusion here. It is

the policy of Monroe, and of Washington, and of Jefferson—"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliance with none."

A due regard for the interests and prosperity of all the people demands that our finances shall be established upon such a sound and sensible basis as shall secure the safety and confidence of business interests and make the wages of labor sure and steady, and that our system of revenue shall be so adjusted as to relieve the people of unnecessary taxation, having a due regard to the interests of capital invested and workingmen employed in American industries, and preventing the accumulation of a surplus in the Treasury to tempt extravagance and waste.

Care for the property of the nation and for the needs of future settlers requires that the public domain should be protected from purloining schemes and unlawful occupation.

The conscience of the people demands that the Indians within our boundaries shall be fairly and honestly treated as wards of the government, and their education and civilization promoted with a view to their ultimate citizenship, and that polygamy in the Territories, destructive of the family relation and offensive to the moral sense of the civilized world, shall be repressed.

The laws should be rigidly enforced which prohibit the immigration of a servile class to compete with American labor, with no intention of acquiring citizenship, and bringing with them

and retaining habits and customs repugnant to our civilization.

The people demand reform in the administration of the government and the application of business principles to public affairs. As a means to this end, civil service reform should be in good faith enforced. Our citizens have the right to protection from the incompetency of public employees who hold their places solely as the reward of partizan service, and from the corrupting influence of those who promise and the vicious methods of those who expect such rewards; and those who worthily seek public employment have the right to insist that merit and competency shall be recognized instead of party subserviency or the surrender of honest political belief.

In the administration of a government pledged to do equal and exact justice to all men, there should be no pretext for anxiety touching the protection of the freedmen in their rights or their security in the enjoyment of their privileges under the Constitution and its amendments. All discussion as to their fitness for the place accorded to them as American citizens is idle and unprofitable except as it suggests the necessity for their improvement. The fact that they are citizens entitles them to all the rights due to that relation and charges them with all its duties, obligations, and responsibilities.

These topics and the constant and ever-varying wants of an active and enterprising popula-

tion may well receive the attention and the patriotic endeavor of all who make and execute the Federal law. Our duties are practical and call for industrious application, an intelligent perception of the claims of public office, and above all, a firm determination, by united action, to secure to all the people of the land the full benefits of the best form of government ever vouchsafed to man. And let us not trust to human effort alone, but humbly acknowledging the power and goodness of Almighty God, who presides over the destiny of nations and who has at all times been revealed in our country's history, let us invoke His aid and His blessing upon our labors.

II

HIS EULOGY OF McKINLEY[1]

To-day the grave closes over the dead body of the man but lately chosen by the people of the United States from among their number to represent their nationality, preserve, protect and defend their Constitution, to faithfully execute the laws ordained for their welfare, and safely to hold and keep the honor and integrity of the Republic. His time of service is ended, not by the expiration of time, but by the tragedy of assassination. He has passed from public sight,

[1] Remarks to the students of Princeton University on September 19, 1901, and printed here from a copy kindly furnished by Mr. Cleveland for the purpose.

not joyously bearing the garlands and wreaths of his countrymen's approving acclaim, but amid the sobs and tears of a mourning nation. He has gone to his home, not the habitation of earthly peace and quiet, bright with domestic comfort and joy, but to the dark and narrow house appointed for all the sons of men, there to rest until the morning light of the resurrection shall gleam in the East.

All our people loved their dead president. His kindly nature and lovable traits of character and his amiable consideration for all about him will long be in the minds and hearts of his countrymen. He loved them in return with such patriotism and unselfishness that in the hour of their grief and humiliation he would say to them: "It is God's will; I am content. If there is a lesson in my life or death, let it be taught to those who still live and have the destiny of their country in their keeping."

Let us, then, as our dead is buried out of our sight, seek for the lessons and the admonitions that may be suggested by the life and death which constitute our theme.

First in my thoughts are the lessons to be learned from the career of William McKinley by the young men who make up the student body of our university. These lessons are not obscure nor difficult. They teach the value of study and mental training, but they teach more impressively that the road to usefulness and to the only success worth having, will be missed or lost

except it is sought and kept by the light of those qualities of heart, which it is sometimes supposed may safely be neglected or subordinated in university surroundings. This is a great mistake. Study and study hard, but never let the thought enter your mind that study alone or the greatest possible accumulation of learning alone will lead you to the heights of usefulness and success.

The man who is universally mourned to-day achieved the highest distinction which his great country can confer on any man, and he lived a useful life. He was not deficient in education, but with all you will hear of his grand career, and of his services to his country and his fellow citizens, you will not hear that either the high place he reached or what he accomplished was due entirely to his education. You will instead constantly hear as accounting for his great success that he was obedient and affectionate as a son, patriotic and faithful as a soldier, honest and upright as a citizen, tender and devoted as a husband, and truthful, generous, unselfish, moral and clean in every relation of life. He never thought any of these things too weak for manliness. Make no mistake. Here was a most distinguished man, a great man, a useful man—who became distinguished, great and useful because he had, and retained unimpaired, the qualities of heart which I fear university students sometimes feel like keeping in the background or abandoning.

There is a most serious lesson for all of us

in the tragedy of our late president's death. The shock of it is so great that it is hard at this time to read this lesson calmly. We can hardly fail to see, however, behind the bloody deed of the assassin, horrible figures and faces from which it will not do to turn away. If we are to escape further attack upon our peace and security, we must boldly and resolutely grapple with the monster of anarchy. It is not a thing that we can safely leave to be dealt with by party or partizanship. Nothing can guarantee us against its menace except the teaching and the practise of the best citizenship, the exposure of the ends and aims of the gospel of discontent and hatred of social order, and the brave enactment and execution of repressive laws.

Our universities and colleges can not refuse to join in the battle against the tendencies of anarchy. Their help in discovering and warning against the relationship between the vicious councils and deeds of blood, and their steadying influence upon the elements of unrest, can not fail to be of inestimable value.

By the memory of our murdered president, let us resolve to cultivate and preserve the qualities that made him great and useful; and let us determine to meet the call of patriotic duty in every time of our country's danger or need.

GRADY

THE OLD SOUTH AND THE NEW[1]

(1886)

Born in 1851, died in 1889; for many years Editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*.

THERE was a South of slavery and secession—that South is dead. There is a South of union and freedom—that South, thank God, is living, breathing, growing every hour.

These words, delivered from the immortal lips of Benjamin H. Hill, at Tammany Hall in 1866, true then and truer now, I shall make my text to-night.

Mr. President and Gentlemen, let me express to you my appreciation of the kindness by which I am permitted to address you. I make this abrupt acknowledgment advisedly, for I feel that if, when I raise my provincial voice in this ancient and august presence, I could find courage for no more than the opening sentence, it would be well if in that sentence I had met in

[1] Delivered before the New England Society at its annual dinner in New York City, December 12, 1886—a speech which made him at the time a national figure. Grady afterward said: "When I found myself on my feet, every nerve in my body was strung as tight as a fiddle-string and all tingling. I knew then that I had a message for that assemblage. As soon as I opened my mouth it came rushing out." Abridged.

a rough sense my obligation as a guest, and had perished, so to speak, with courtesy on my lips and grace in my heart. Permitted, through your kindness, to catch my second wind, let me say that I appreciate the significance of being the first Southerner to speak at this board, which bears the substance, if it surpasses the semblance, of original New England hospitality, and honors the sentiment that in turn honors you, but in which my personality is lost and the compliment to my people made plain.

Pardon me one word, Mr. President, spoken for the sole purpose of getting into the volumes that go out annually, freighted with the rich eloquence of your speakers, the fact that the Cavalier as well as the Puritan was on the continent in its early days, and that he was "up and able to be about." I have read your books carefully and I find no mention of that fact, which seems an important one to me for preserving a sort of historical equilibrium, if for nothing else.

Let me remind you that the Virginia Cavalier first challenged France on the continent; that Cavalier John Smith gave New England its very name, and was so pleased with the job that he has been handing his own name around ever since; and that while Miles Standish was cutting off men's ears for courting a girl without her parents' consent, and forbade men to kiss their wives on Sunday, the Cavalier was courting everything in sight, and that the Almighty had vouchsafed great increase to the Cavalier

Colonies, the huts in the wilderness being as full as the nests in the woods.

But having incorporated the Cavalier as a fact in your charming little books, I shall let him work out his own salvation, as he has always done, with engaging gallantry, and we will hold no controversy as to his merits. Why should we? Neither Puritan nor Cavalier long survived as such. The virtues and good traditions of both happily still live for the inspiration of their sons and the saving of the old fashion. But both Puritan and Cavalier were lost in the storm of the first Revolution, and the American citizen, supplanting both and stronger than either, took possession of the Republic bought by their common blood and fashioned to wisdom, and charged himself with teaching men government and establishing the voice of the people as the voice of God.

My friends, Doctor Talmage has told you that the typical American has yet to come. Let me tell you that he has already come. Great types, like valuable plants, are slow to flower and fruit. But from the union of these Colonies, Puritans and Cavaliers, from the straightening of their purposes and the crossing of their blood, slow perfecting through a century, came he who stands as the first typical American, the first who comprehended within himself all the strength and gentleness, all the majesty and grace of this Republic—Abraham Lincoln.

He was the sum of Puritan and Cavalier, for

in his ardent nature were fused the virtues of both, and in the depths of his great soul the faults of both were lost. He was greater than Puritan, greater than Cavalier, in that he was American, and that in his honest form were first gathered the vast and thrilling forces of his ideal government—charging it with such tremendous meaning and elevating it above human suffering that martyrdom, tho infamously aimed, came as a fitting crown to a life consecrated from the cradle to human liberty. Let us, each cherishing the traditions and honoring his fathers, build with reverend hands to the type of this simple but sublime life, in which all types are honored, and in our common glory as Americans there will be plenty and to spare for your forefathers and for mine.

Doctor Talmage has drawn for you, with a master's hand, the picture of your returning armies. He has told you how, in the pomp and circumstance of war, they came back to you, marching with proud and victorious tread, reading their glory in a nation's eyes! Will you bear with me while I tell you of another army that sought its home at the close of the late war—an army that marched home in defeat and not in victory—in pathos and not in splendor, but in glory that equaled yours, and to hearts as loving as ever welcomed heroes home! Let me picture to you the foot-sore Confederate soldier, as, buttoning up in his faded gray jacket the parole which was to bear testimony to his children of

his fidelity and faith, he turned his face southward from Appomattox in April, 1865.

Think of him as ragged, half-starved, heavy-hearted, enfeebled by want and wounds, having fought to exhaustion, he surrenders his gun, wrings the hands of his comrades in silence, and lifting his tear-stained and pallid face for the last time to the graves that dot old Virginia hills, pulls his gray cap over his brow and begins the slow and faithful journey. What does he find—let me ask you who went to your homes eager to find, in the welcome you had justly earned, full payment for four years' sacrifice—what does he find when, having followed the battle-stained cross against overwhelming odds, dreading death not half so much as surrender, he reaches the home he left so prosperous and beautiful?

He finds his house in ruins, his farm devastated, his slaves free, his stock killed, his barns empty, his trade destroyed, his money worthless, his social system, feudal in its magnificence, swept away; his people without law or legal status, his comrades slain, and the burdens of others heavy on his shoulders. Crushed by defeat, his very traditions are gone. Without money, credit, employment, material, or training, and, besides all this, confronted with the gravest problem that ever met human intelligence,—the establishing of a status for the vast body of his liberated slaves.

What does he do—this hero in gray with a

heart of gold? Does he sit down in sullenness and despair? Not for a day. Surely God, who had stripped him of his prosperity, inspired him in his adversity. As ruin was never before so overwhelming, never was restoration swifter. The soldier stepped from the trenches into the furrow; horses that had charged Federal guns marched before the plow, and fields that ran red with human blood in April were green with the harvest in June; women reared in luxury cut up their dresses and made breeches for their husbands, and, with a patience and heroism that fit women always as a garment, gave their hands to work. There was little bitterness in all this. Cheerfulness and frankness prevailed.

I want to say to General Sherman, who is considered an able man in our parts, tho some people think he is a kind of careless man about fire, that from the ashes he left us in 1864 we have raised a brave and beautiful city; that somehow or other we have caught the sunshine in the bricks and mortar of our homes, and have builded therein not one ignoble prejudice or memory.

But what is the sum of our work? We have found out that in the summing up the free negro counts more than he did as a slave. We have planted the schoolhouse on the hilltop and made it free to white and black. We have sowed towns and cities in the place of theories, and put business above politics. We have challenged your spinners in Massachusetts and your iron-makers

in Pennsylvania. We have learned that the $400,000,000 annually received from our cotton crop will make us rich when the supplies that make it are home-raised. We have reduced the commercial rate of interest from twenty-four to six per cent., and are floating four per cent. bonds.

We have learned that one Northern immigrant is worth fifty foreigners; and have smoothed the path to southward, wiped out the place where Mason and Dixon's line used to be, and hung out our latch-string to you and yours. We have reached the point that marks perfect harmony in every household, when the husband confesses that the pies which his wife cooks are as good as those his mother used to bake; and we admit that the sun shines as brightly and the moon as softly as it did before the war. We have established thrift in city and country. We have fallen in love with our work. We have restored comfort to homes from which culture and elegance never departed. We have let economy take root and spread among us as rank as the crabgrass which sprung from Sherman's cavalry camps, until we are ready to lay odds on the Georgia Yankee as he manufactures relics of the battlefield in a one-story shanty and squeezes pure olive-oil out of his cottonseed, against any Down-Easter that ever swapped wooden nutmegs for flannel sausage in the valleys of Vermont. Above all, we know that we have achieved in these "piping times of peace" a fuller inde-

pendence for the South than that which our fathers sought to win in the forum by their eloquence or compel in the field by their swords.

It is a rare privilege, sir, to have had part, however humble, in this work. Never was nobler duty confided to human hands than the uplifting and upbuilding of the prostrate and bleeding South—misguided, perhaps, but beautiful in her suffering, and honest, brave, and generous always. In the record of her social, industrial, and political illustration we await with confidence the verdict of the world.

But what of the negro? Have we solved the problem he presents or progressed in honor and equity toward solution? Let the record speak to the point. No section shows a more prosperous laboring population than the negroes of the South; none in fuller sympathy with the employing and land-owning class. He shares our school fund, has the fullest protection of our laws and the friendship of our people. Self-interest as well as honor demand that he should have this. Our future, our very existence, depend upon working out this problem in full and exact justice.

We understand that when Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, your victory was assured, for he then committed you to the cause of human liberty, against which the arms of men can not prevail—while those of our statesmen who trusted to make slavery the cornerstone of the Confederacy doomed us to defeat

as far as he could, committing us to a cause that reason could not defend or the sword maintain in sight of advancing civilization.

Had Mr. Toombs said, which he did not say, "that he would call the roll of his slaves at the foot of Bunker Hill," he would have been foolish, for he might have known that whenever slavery became entangled in war it must perish, and that the chattel in human flesh ended for ever in New England when your fathers—not to be blamed for parting with what did not pay—sold their slaves to our fathers—not to be praised for knowing a paying thing when they saw it.

The relations of the Southern people with the negro are close and cordial. We remember with what fidelity for four years he guarded our defenseless women and children, whose husbands and fathers were fighting against his freedom. To his eternal credit be it said that whenever he struck a blow for his own liberty he fought in open battle, and when at last he raised his black and humble hands that the shackles might be struck off, those hands were innocent of wrong against his helpless charges, and worthy to be taken in loving grasp by every man who honors loyalty and devotion.

Ruffians have maltreated him, rascals have misled him, philanthropists established a bank for him, but the South, with the North, protests against injustice to this simple and sincere people. To liberty and enfranchisement is as far as

law can carry the negro. The rest must be left to conscience and common sense. It must be left to those among whom his lot is cast, with whom he is indissolubly connected, and whose prosperity depends upon their possessing his intelligent sympathy and confidence. Faith has been kept with him, in spite of calumnious assertions to the contrary by those who assume to speak for us or by frank opponents. Faith will be kept with him in the future, if the South holds her reason and integrity.

But have we kept faith with you? In the fullest sense, yes. When Lee surrendered—I do not say when Johnston surrendered, because I understand he still alludes to the time when he met General Sherman last as the time when he determined to abandon any further prosecution of the struggle—when Lee surrendered, I say, and Johnston quit, the South became, and has since been, loyal to this Union.

We fought hard enough to know that we were whipped and in perfect frankness accept as final the arbitrament of the sword to which we had appealed. The South found her jewel in the toad's head of defeat. The shackles that had held her in narrow limitations fell for ever when the shackles of the negro slave were broken. Under the old régime the negroes were slaves to the South; the South was a slave to the system. The old plantation, with its simple police regulations and feudal habit, was the only type possible under slavery. Thus was gathered in the hands

of a splendid and chivalric oligarchy the substance that should have been diffused among the people, as the rich blood, under certain artificial conditions, is gathered at the heart, filling that with affluent rapture, but leaving the body chill and colorless.

The old South rested everything on slavery and agriculture, unconscious that these could neither give nor maintain healthy growth. The new South presents a perfect democracy, the oligarchs leading in the popular movement—a social system compact and closely knitted, less splendid on the surface, but stronger at the core—a hundred farms for every plantation, fifty homes for every palace—and a diversified industry that meets the complex need of this complex age.

The new South is enamored of her new work. Her soul is stirred with the breath of a new life. The light of a grander day is falling fair on her face. She is thrilling with the consciousness of growing power and prosperity. As she stands upright, full statured and equal among the people of the earth, breathing the keen air and looking out upon the expanded horizon, she understands that her emancipation came because through the inscrutable wisdom of God her honest purpose was crossed, and her brave armies were beaten.

This is said in no spirit of time-serving or apology. The South has nothing for which to apologize. She believes that the late struggle

between the States was war and not rebellion, revolution and not conspiracy, and that her convictions were as honest as yours. I should be unjust to the dauntless spirit of the South and to my own convictions if I did not make this plain in this presence. The South has nothing to take back. In my native town of Athens is a monument that crowns its central hill—a plain, white shaft. Deep cut into its shining side is a name dear to me above the names of men—that of a brave and simple man who died in a brave and simple faith.

Not for all the glories of New England, from Plymouth Rock all the way, would I exchange the heritage he left me in his soldier's death. To the foot of that I shall send my children's children to reverence him who ennobled their name with his heroic blood. But, sir, speaking from the shadow of that memory which I honor as I do nothing else on earth, I say that the cause in which he suffered and for which he gave his life was adjudged by higher and fuller wisdom than his or mine, and I am glad that the omniscient God held the balance of battle in His Almighty hand and that human slavery was swept for ever from American soil, and the American Union was saved from the wreck of war.

This message, Mr. President, comes to you from consecrated ground. Every foot of soil about the city in which I live is as sacred as a battle-ground of the Republic. Every hill that

invests it is hallowed to you by the blood of your brothers who died for your victory, and doubly hallowed to us by the blood of those who died hopeless, but undaunted in defeat—sacred soil to all of us—rich with memories that make us purer and stronger and better—silent but stanch witnesses, in its red desolation, of the matchless valor of American hearts and the deathless glory of American arms—speaking an eloquent witness in its white peace and prosperity to the indissoluble union of American States and the imperishable brotherhood of the American people.

Now, what answer has New England to this message? Will she permit the prejudice of war to remain in the hearts of the conquerors when it has died in the hearts of the conquered? Will she transmit this prejudice to the next generation, that in their hearts which never felt the generous ardor of conflict it may perpetuate itself? Will she withhold, save in strained courtesy, the hand which, straight from his soldier's heart, Grant offered to Lee at Appomattox? Will she make the vision of a restored and happy people, which gathered above the couch of your dying captain, filling his heart with grace, touching his lips with praise, and glorifying his path to the grave—will she make this vision on which the last sigh of his expiring soul breathed a benediction, a cheat and delusion? If she does, the South, never abject in asking for comradeship, must accept with dignity its refusal;

but if she does not refuse to accept in frankness and sincerity this message of good will and friendship, then will the prophecy of Webster, delivered in this very Society forty years ago amid tremendous applause, become true, be verified in its fullest sense, when he said: "Standing hand to hand and clasping hands, we should remain united as we have been for sixty years, citizens of the same country, members of the same government, united, all united now and united for ever." There have been difficulties, contentions, and controversies, but I tell you that in my judgment—

> ——"those opened eyes,
> Which, like the meteors of a troubled heaven,
> All of one nature, of one substance bred,
> Did lately meet in th' intestine shock,
> Shall now, in mutual well-beseeming ranks,
> March all one way."

HARRISON

HIS INAUGURAL ADDRESS

(1889)

Born in 1833, died in 1901; served in the Civil War (1862–65), becoming Brevet Brigadier-General; elected United States Senator from Indiana in 1881; elected President of the United States in 1888; an unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1892.

SURELY I do not misinterpret the spirit of the occasion when I assume that the whole body of the people covenant with me and with each other to-day to support and defend the Constitution and the union of the States, to yield willing obedience to all the laws and each to every other citizen his equal civil and political rights. Entering thus solemnly into covenant with each other, we may reverently invoke and confidently expect the favor and help of Almighty God—that he will give to me wisdom, strength, and fidelity, and to our people a spirit of fraternity and a love of righteousness and peace.

I will not attempt to note the marvelous, and, in great part, happy contrasts between our country as it steps over the threshold into its second century of organized existence under the Constitution, and that weak but wisely ordered young nation that looked undauntedly down the first century, when all its years stretched out before it.

Our people will not fail at this time to recall

the incidents which accompanied the institution of government under the Constitution, or to find inspiration and guidance in the teachings and example of Washington and his great associates, and hope and courage in the contrast which thirty-eight populous and prosperous States offer to the thirteen States, weak in everything except courage and the love of liberty, that then fringed our Atlantic seaboard.

The Territory of Dakota has now a population greater than any of the original States (except Virginia), and greater than the aggregate of five of the smaller States in 1790. The center of population when our national capital was located was east of Baltimore, and it was argued by many well-informed persons that it would move eastward rather than westward; yet in 1880 it was found to be near Cincinnati—and the new census about to be taken will show another stride to the westward. That which was the body has come to be only the rich fringe of the nation's robe. But our growth has not been limited to territory, population, and aggregate wealth, marvelous as it has been in each of those directions. The masses of our people are better fed, clothed, and housed than their fathers were. The facilities for popular education have been vastly enlarged and more generally diffused.

The virtues of courage and patriotism have given recent proof of their continued presence and increasing power in the hearts and over the

lives of our people. The influences of religion have been multiplied and strengthened. The sweet offices of charity have greatly increased. The virtue of temperance is held in higher estimation. We have not attained an ideal condition. Not all of our people are happy and prosperous; not all of them are virtuous and law-abiding. But on the whole, the opportunities offered to the individual to secure the comforts of life are better than are found elsewhere, and largely better than they were here one hundred years ago.

Shall the prejudices and paralysis of slavery continue to hang upon the skirts of progress? How long will those who rejoice that slavery no longer exists cherish or tolerate the incapacities it put upon their communities? I look hopefully to the continuance of our protective system and to the consequent development of manufacturing and mining enterprises in the States hitherto wholly given to agriculture as a potent influence in the perfect unification of our people. The men who have invested their capital in these enterprises, the farmers who have felt the benefit of their neighborhood, and the men who work in the shop or field, will not fail to find and to defend a community of interest.

Is it not quite possible that the farmers and the promoters of the great mining and manufacturing enterprises which have recently been established in the South may yet find that the free ballot of the workingman, without distinction of

race, is needed for their defense as well as his own? I do not doubt that if those men in the South who now accept the tariff views of Clay and the constitutional expositions of Webster would courageously avow and defend their real convictions, they would not find it difficult, by friendly instruction and cooperation, to make the black man their efficient and safe ally, not only in establishing correct principles in our national administration, but in preserving for their local communities the benefits of social order and economical and honest government. At least until the good offices of kindness and education have been fairly tried, the contrary conclusion can not be plausibly urged. If our great corporations would more scrupulously observe their legal limitations and duties, they would have less cause to complain of the unlawful limitations of their rights or of violent interference with their operations. The community that by concert, open or secret, among its citizens, denies to a portion of its members their plain rights under the law, has severed the only safe bond of social order and prosperity. The evil works from a bad both ways. It demoralizes those who practise it, and destroys the faith of those who suffer by it in the efficiency of the law as a safe protector. The man in whose breast that faith has been darkened is naturally the subject of dangerous and uncanny suggestions. Those who use unlawful methods, if moved by no higher motive than the selfishness that prompted them

may well stop and inquire what is to be the end of this.

An unlawful expedient can not become a permanent condition of government. If the educated and influential classes in a community either practise or connive at the systematic violation of laws that seem to them to cross their convenience, what can they expect when the lesson that convenience or a supposed class interest is a sufficient cause for lawlessness has been well learned by the ignorant classes? A community where law is the rule of conduct and where courts, not mobs, execute its penalties, is the only attractive field for business investments and honest labor.

If in any of the States the public security is thought to be threatened by ignorance among the electors, the obvious remedy is education. The sympathy and help of our people will not be withheld from any community struggling with special embarrassments or difficulties connected with the suffrage, if the remedies proposed proceed upon lawful lines and are promoted by just and honorable methods. How shall those who practise election frauds recover that respect for the sanctity of the ballot which is the first condition and obligation of good citizenship? The man who has come to regard the ballot-box as a juggler's hat has renounced his allegiance.

Let us exalt patriotism and moderate our party contentions. Let those who would die for the flag on the field of battle give a better proof

of their patriotism and a higher glory to their country by promoting fraternity and justice. A party success that is achieved by unfair methods or by practises that partake of revolution is hurtful and evanescent, even from a party standpoint. We should hold our differing opinions in mutual respect, and, having submitted them to the arbitrament of the ballot, should accept an adverse judgment with the same respect that we would have demanded of our opponents if the decision had been more in our favor.

No other people have a government more worthy of their respect and love, or a land so magnificent in extent, so pleasant to look upon, and so full of generous suggestion to enterprise and labor. God has placed upon our head a diadem, and has laid at our feet power and wealth beyond definition or calculation. But we must not forget that we take these gifts upon the condition that justice and mercy shall hold the reins of power, and that the upward avenues of hope shall be free of all the people.

I do not mistrust the future. Dangers have been in frequent ambush along our path, but we have uncovered and vanquished them all. Passion has swept some of our communities, but only to give us a new demonstration that the great body of our people are stable, patriotic, and law-abiding. No political party can long pursue advantage at the expense of public honor, or by rude and indecent methods, without protest and fatal disaffection in its own body. The peaceful

agencies of commerce are more fully revealing the necessary unity of all our communities, and the increasing intercourse of our people is promoting mutual respect. We shall find unalloyed pleasure in the revelation which our census will make of the swift development of the great resources of some of the States. Each State will bring its generous contribution to the great aggregate of the nation's increase. And when the harvests from the fields, the cattle from the hills, and the ores from the earth shall have been weighed, counted, and valued, we will turn from the mall to crown with the highest honor the State that has most promoted education, virtue, justice, and patriotism among its people.

MISS WILLARD

WORK DONE FOR HUMANITY[1]

(1890)

Born in 1839, died in 1898; graduated from Northwestern Female College at Evanston, Illinois, in 1859; taught and traveled until 1874, when she became Secretary of the Women's Christian Temperance Union; in 1883 founded the World's Women's Christian Temperance Union.

I WISH we were all more thorough students of the mighty past, for we should thus be rendered braver prophets of the future, and more cheerful workers in the present. History shows us with what tenacity the human race survives. Earthquake, famine, and pestilence have done their worst, but over them rolls a healing tide of years and they are lost to view; on sweeps the great procession, and hardly shows a scar. Rulers around whom clustered new forms of civilization pass away; but greater men succeed them. Nations are rooted up; great hopes seem blighted; revolutions rise and rivers run with the blood of patriots; the globe itself seems headed toward the abyss; new patriots are born; higher hopes bloom out like stars; humanity emerges from the dark ages vastly ahead of what

[1] From an address before the Seventeenth Convention of the World's Women's Christian Temperance Union at Atlanta, Georgia, in 1890.

it was on entering that cave of gloom, and ever the right comes uppermost; and now is Christ's kingdom nearer than when we first believed.

Only those who have not studied history lose heart in great reforms; only those unread in the biography of genius imagine themselves to be original. Except in the realm of material invention, there is nothing new under the sun. There is no reform which some great soul has not dreamed of centuries ago; there is not a doctrine that some father of the Church did not set forth. The Greek philosophers and early Christian Fathers boxed the compass once for all; we may take our choice of what they have left on record. Let us then learn a wise humility, but at the same time a humble wisdom, as we remember that there are but two classes of men—one which declares that our times are the worst the world has seen, and another which claims our times as best—and he who claims this, all revelation, all science, all history witnesses is right and will be right forevermore.

The most normal and the most perfect human being is the one who most thoroughly addresses himself to the activity of his best powers, gives himself most thoroughly to the world around him, flings himself out into the midst of humanity, and is so preoccupied by his own beneficent reaction on the world that he is practically unconscious of a separate existence. Introspection, and retrospection were good for the cloister; but the uplook, the outlook and the onlook are alone

worthy the modern Christian. To change the figure, a normal Christian stands in the midst of a great, beautiful and varied landscape. It is the landscape of beneficent work. Above him reaches the boundless skies, brilliant with the stars of God and Heaven.

Love and friendship form a beautiful rainbow over his landscape and reach up toward his sky. But the only two great environments of the soul are work for humanity and faith in God. Those wounded in love will find that affection, dear and vital as it is, comes to us not as the whole of life, not as its wide wondrous landscape of the earth, not as its beautiful vision of the sky, but as its beautiful embellishment, its rainbow fair and sweet. But were it gone there would still remain the two greatest and most satisfying pictures on which the soul can gaze —humanity and God.

BLAND

THE PARTING OF THE WAYS[1]

(1893)

Born in 1835, died in 1899; admitted to the bar in Utah in 1860; settled in Missouri, where in 1872 he was elected to Congress, serving until 1895; again elected to Congress in 1897; in 1896 an unsuccessful candidate for the Presidential nomination.

It is said that history repeats itself, and it seems that the Democratic party is especially the victim of history repeated in some way. When the people intrusted our party in 1884 with the administration of the government, when the Democratic House of Representatives was chosen, I remember full well, and I see around me gentlemen who remember it as I do, for they were here at that time, that before the inauguration of the president of the United States whom we had elected, the emissaries of Wall Street swarmed the lobbies of the House and this capitol, just as they did last winter, demanding—what? Demanding the repeal of the so-called Bland Act.

Precisely the same proceedings that we had here last winter! We were told then that it was the wish of the executive-elect that that Act be

[1] From a speech in the House of Representatives, on August 11, 1893.

repealed, as we were told the same thing last winter. We were told that it was his opinion and the opinion of his advisers that this country was coming then to the single silver standard. If we did not repeal that law, we were threatened with a panic, with gold going to a premium. The House was forced to a vote upon that subject before we were adjourned at that time, as we were practically last winter; but it voted the proposition down by a tremendous majority. During the following summer, the New York papers, as they have been this summer, were filled with predictions of gold premiums and panics.

Now, sir, we are asked here deliberately to repeal that law, and I want to call the attention of my friends on this side of the House, who proclaim themselves to be friends of free coinage at a reasonable ratio—I want to call their attention to this point and to ask them this question: Why do you gentlemen insist that you will repeal this law and send silver down probably fifteen cents an ounce before you fix the ratio? Is that an act friendly to silver? Can any gentleman here face his free coinage constituency and defend his vote subtracting from the value of silver fifteen cents an ounce before he votes to fix the ratio? I dare him to undertake it. He can not do it.

The claim is not sincere that the president expects hereafter to recommend bimetallism, for he does not do it in his message, and that claim misrepresents his position. He recommends the

reverse. The concluding paragraph of the message means, if it means anything, that after you shall have totally demonetized silver by repealing this Sherman Act, you will be required to go further in the same direction; and I make a prediction here and now, and, my friends, I want you to watch the proceedings of Congress in these coming weeks of this extra session, or of the next regular session, to see whether I am right or not.

My prediction is that in order to carry out the recommendations of that message we shall be called upon to sell bonds to procure gold. For what? To redeem all our pecuniary obligations, according to the very language of that message, in that money which is recognized by the principal nations of the world. Why did not the president say "gold"? We know what his language means. You are asked to load up the federal Treasury with gold, to redeem every pecuniary obligations to the government with gold, altho the standard silver dollar is the identical dollar on which bond obligations were based when they were issued, because they called for coin of the standard value at the time of their issue, and that was standard.

But now, I repeat, we shall have to redeem all this bullion, all these Sherman notes in gold; we shall have to sell bonds to get gold to redeem all our greenbacks, all our silver certificates, and we will be compelled to carry our silver dollars as so much dead weight of bullion in the Treas-

ury, so that we might as well dump them into the Potomac. That is what all this means. In other words, every piece of paper money issued in this country to-day, every silver certificate, every greenback, every bond, every Sherman note, is to be redeemed in gold, and we must procure the gold for their redemption.

What, then, are you to do with your silver bullion and with all your silver dollars, together about $500,000,000? They are to be demonetized as a base metal, and you know it. I am talking to intelligent gentlemen here who have read it; who can understand it. Why should you go on, then, to try to deceive yourselves and your constituents on this subject? There is no silver in that message, and gentlemen on the other side will simply do themselves and the subject justice if hereafter, in the course of their debate, they will leave silver out of it, because they are proposing a measure in which there is no consideration whatever for silver.

It is this fight upon silver that has precipitated this panic; and the repeal of the Sherman law will only intensify it, not relieve it. The panic will be relieved when everything gets so low that people see they can make money by buying; when they begin to buy, prices will go up, and when everybody is buying money will come from its hoarding places and you will have some relief. In no other way will relief come.

Gold is coming to us to-day. Notwithstanding we are told the people across the water are afraid

to invest here for fear that we will not pay in gold, yet these people are sustaining prices to-day and sending here all the money that they can spare. There was a panic in gold-using Australia that has bankrupted that whole people and sent terror to the banks over England. We know that gold can not be obtained there except by paying for it, yet it is coming here.

Talk about a premium on gold! Here is the Treasury of the United States that is open to the plunder of every speculator in the civilized world. He can take his Sherman note or his greenback or any other government currency there and get gold without cost. Did you ever notice the names of the gentlemen in New York who are shipping gold abroad, or bringing it back? Every one of those names that I have seen has a foreign termination; every one of those gentlemen, so far as I am advised, is an agent for or conducts a branch bank of some bank across the water.

If you go to the Bank of England to get gold for export you must pay a premium on it; if you go to the Bank of France to get gold for export you must pay a premium on it. The case is the same with every other banking house in Europe; no gold can be obtained there without paying a premium. But here is the Treasury of the United States professing to be so helpless that it can not prevent every gold speculator from robbing the government of its gold. Our Treasury will not pay out the silver which it might pay.

The Bank of France will pay out silver, or will charge a premium on gold if it is wanted for anything but domestic use. But the Treasury of the United States, instead of paying out gold and silver in equal quantities and thus preserving its gold (if it is necessary to preserve it,—tho I see no necessity of preserving it, for all our money is at a premium to-day), lets everybody go there and get as much gold as he pleases. Why not pay out the silver when we have more of it than we have of gold, or pay out gold when we have more of it than silver, and thus protect ourselves?

It is because the administration is hostile to silver; and thus it is surrendering this country to the Shylocks of the Old World who have made war upon it. The aristocracy of Western Europe has absolutely tabooed silver in those countries and driven it away from there. Here it finds its only resting place. The last fight for the white metal is to be made here in this country and in this House, my friends. Will you stand by it now, or will you let the Shylocks come and have their way? It is for you to determine.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we can trust the people of this country on a question of as vital importance as this. The question is now before us. This is its last resort. Will you virtually demonetize the money of nearly 70,000,000 of people, with a vast empire of 3,000,000 of square miles—a people thirsting for money to open up new railroads, to establish new factories, to

operate new places of business, to inaugurate new industries; 70,000,000 people demanding money, twice what we have to-day, a new people, a new country, a free people,—or they ought to be free whether they are or not.

Are you to give up the fight and let this vast body of our wealth go to ruin? I do not believe it. We know well enough that if we repeal this law and give nothing for it, the people of this country will regard it as a total demonetization of silver, which it will be, so far as this Congress is concerned, without any question.

What does free coinage of silver mean? It means that the holders of silver bullion, at some ratio to be fixed in the bill, may go to the mints of the government and have it struck into legal money of the government and deposit the dollars so coined, if the holder so desires, and have a certificate issued to him in place of it. What is the effect of unlimited coinage of silver in this country? and I invite your attention to this particularly, because it is a question of vital importance. It means that the silver coins of the United States at whatever ratio is fixed, and I want the present ratio that we have now, 16 to 1, maintained precisely as it is—it means that the silver of the world can come here in exchange for what we have to sell.

Yes, it means that the silver of the whole world can come here. But they say that we will be flooded with the world's silver; that it will be dumped down upon us. Now, let us see about

that for a moment. It means that any one with sixteen ounces of silver can come here from any part of the world, or with one ounce of gold, and he can buy your grain, he can buy your house and lot, he can buy your manufactured product, and buy the property and commodities of all sorts that you have to sell with either the one or the other; that is to say, he can buy just as much with his sixteen ounces of silver as with his one ounce of gold.

With the billions upon billions of property existing in this country to-day and being produced in this country every year, we simply offer to exchange that which we have in abundance on a basis of one pound of gold as the equivalent of sixteen pounds of silver. We invite, then, the world to come with its silver and make the exchange. No nation now, it is true, offers in exchange for silver the gold at any fixed ratio; consequently, all the silver that is coined is used in the countries where it is coined. And why? Because no great power offers to exchange commodities for one metal or the other at any fixed ratio. That is the only trouble with silver to-day.

What is it, then, that you are asked to do? It is that we, the government of the United States, we as a people say to all the world, especially the silver-using people, all of the Asiatic nations and the Great Indies, come here with your white metal, if you choose to come, and trade with us on the basis of 16 to 1, and buy your commodities from us at that ratio.

When you do that, will not the silver-using people come to our shores to make their purchases rather than go to the European powers, where they demand a ratio of 22 to 25? There can be no doubt of the answer to that question.

Many now born, by the time they are voters will compose part of a nation containing perhaps one hundred and twenty-five millions of people, with unsurpassed energies, with a genius nowhere equaled, and with a vast territory upon which those energies and that genius can operate. But a short time ago when you looked across the Alleghany Mountains you beheld the Western wilderness roamed only by the savage and wild beast. To-day it is teeming with its millions of civilized people, and when you cross the Mississippi you just begin to enter the great domain of this country of ours, for more than two-thirds of it lies beyond the Father of Waters.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is that two-thirds of our territory, rich as it is in gold and silver, embedded together in the same deposits, in the same mountains, so that you can not extract the one without extracting the other,—it is that portion of our territory that would give us the money that we need, the money of the world, good money, hard money, Democratic money; a country that the civilized world must look to for its future monetary supply if it is to continue on what is called the hard-money basis. And yet we are to-day asked to do what? To lay the blighting hand of confiscation upon the

millions of people inhabiting that country; to turn them out as tramps upon the land, merely to satisfy the greed of English gold.

Oh, my God, shall we do such a thing as that? Will you crush the people of your own land and send them abroad as tramps? Will you kill and destroy your own industries, and especially the production of your precious metals that ought to be sent abroad everywhere,—will you do this simply to satisfy the greed of Wall Street, the mere agent of Lombard Street, in oppressing the people of Europe and of this country? It can not be done: it shall not be done! I speak for the great masses of the Mississippi Valley, and those west of it, when I say you shall not do it!

Any political party that undertakes to do it will, in God's name, be trampled, as it ought to be trampled, into the dust of condemnation, now and in the future. Speaking as a Democrat, all my life battling for what I conceived to be Democracy, and what I conceived to be right, I am yet an American above Democracy. I do not intend, we do not intend, that any party shall survive, if we can help it, that will lay the confiscating hand upon Americans in the interest of England or of Europe. Now, mark it. This may be strong language, but heed it. The people mean it, and, my friends of the Eastern Democracy, we bid farewell when you do that thing.

REED

IN CLOSING THE WILSON TARIFF BILL DEBATE[1]

(1894)

Born in 1839, died in 1902; elected to Congress from Maine in 1877, serving until 1899; Speaker of the House in 1889-91, 1895-97, and 1897-99.

In this debate, which has extended over many weeks, one remarkable result has already been reached, a result of the deepest importance to this country. That result is, that the bill before us is odious to both sides of the House. It meets with favor nowhere, and commands the respect of neither party. On this side we believe that while it pretends to be for protection it does not afford it, and on the other side they believe that while it looks toward free trade it does not accomplish it.

It is evident that there is no ground for that hope entertained by so many moderate men, that this bill, bad as it is, could be a resting place where our manufacturing and productive industries, such as may survive, can reestablish themselves and have a sure foundation for the future,

[1] From his speech in the House of Representatives on February 1, 1894, summing up the debate on this bill, as reported in "The Congressional Record."

free from party bickering and party strife. Hence, also, there can be no foundation for that cry, so insidiously raised that this bill should be passed at once, because uncertainty is worse than any bill can possibly be. Were this bill to pass both branches to-day, uncertainty would reign just the same.

It is often said that the truth is the simplest. That is so, after you understand the truth, but when you do not a lie is far simpler. When Copernicus discovered the theory of the universe it took centuries for men to believe it. The Ptolmaic theory was so simple that anybody by using his eyes could see the sun rise in the east and set in the west just like the moon, and to-day most men accept the Copernican theory, not on their own understanding, but on the general belief of mankind.

I shall not, therefore, in what I have to say, be able—being, as I hope, on the side of truth—to rival the charming simplicity of the gentlemen opposite, or, like them, to compress the universe into the nutshell of a speech. I regret this the less because I know that many a philosopher has put the world into a nutshell only to find that the nutshell contained a world in which nobody ever lived, or moved, or had his being, and consequently a world which was of no human account.

Whether the universal sentiment in favor of protection as applied to every country is sound or not, I do not stop to discuss. Whether it is

best for the United States of America alone concerns me now, and the first thing I have to say is, that after thirty years of protection, undisturbed by any serious menace of free trade, up to the very year now last past this country was the greatest and most flourishing nation on the face of this earth. Moreover, with the shadow of this unjustifiable bill resting cold upon it, with mills closed, with hundreds of thousands of men unemployed, industry at a standstill, and prospects before it more gloomy than ever marked its history—except once—this country is still the greatest and the richest that the sun shines on, or ever did shine on.

According to the usual story that is told, England had been engaged with a long and vain struggle with the demon of protection, and had been year after year sinking farther into the depths, until at a moment when she was in her distress and saddest plight, her manufacturing system broken down, "protection, having destroyed home trade by reducing," as Mr. Atkinson says, "the entire population to beggary, destitution, and want." Mr. Cobden and his friends providentially appeared, and after a hard struggle established a principle for all time and for all the world, and straightway England enjoyed the sum of human happiness. Hence all good nations should do as England has done and be happy ever after.

Suppose England, instead of being a little island in the sea, had been the half of a great

continent full of raw material, capable of an internal commerce which would rival the commerce of all the rest of the world.

Suppose every year new millions were flocking to her shores, and every one of those new millions in a few years, as soon as they tasted the delights of a broader life, would become as great a consumer as any one of her own people.

Suppose that these millions, and the 70,000,000 already gathered under the folds of her flag, were every year demanding and receiving a higher wage and therefore broadening her market as fast as her machinery could furnish production. Suppose she had produced cheap food beyond all her wants, and that her laborers spent so much money that whether wheat was 60 cents a bushel or twice that sum hardly entered the thoughts of one of them except when some Democratic tariff bill was paralyzing his business.

Suppose that she was not only but a cannon-shot from France, but that every country in Europe had been brought as near to her as Baltimore is to Washington—for that is what cheap ocean freights mean between us and European producers. Suppose all those countries had her machinery, her skilled workmen, her industrial system, and labor 40 per cent. cheaper. Suppose under that state of facts, with all her manufacturers proclaiming against it, frantic in their disapproval, England had been called upon by Cobden to make the plunge

into free trade, would she have done it? Not if Cobden had been backed by the angelic host. History gives England credit for great sense.

It so happens that America is filled with workers. There are idle people, but they are fewer here than elsewhere except now, when we are living under the shadow of the Wilson Bill. If those workers are all getting good wages they are themselves the market, and if the wages are increasing the market is also increasing. The fact that in this country all the workers have been getting better wages than elsewhere is the very reason why our market is the best in the world and why all the nations of the world are trying to break into it. We do not appreciate the nature of our market ourselves.

We are nominally 70,000,000 people. That is what we are in mere numbers. But as a market for manufactures and choice foods we are potentially 175,000,000 as compared with the next best nation on the globe. Nor is this difficult to prove. Whenever an Englishman earns one dollar an American earns a dollar and sixty cents. I speak within bounds. Both can get the food that keeps body and soul together and the shelter which the body must have for sixty cents. Take sixty cents from a dollar and you have forty cents left. Take that same sixty cents from the dollar and sixty and you have a dollar left—just two and a half times as much. That surplus can be spent in choice foods, in house furnishings, in fine clothes, and all the comforts

of life—in a word, in the products of our manufactures. That makes our population as consumers of products as compared with the English population 200,000,000. Their population is 37,000,000 as consumers of products which one century ago were pure luxuries, while our population is equivalent to 175,000,000.

If this is our comparison with England, what is the comparison with the rest of the world, whose markets our committee are so eager to have in exchange for our own? Mulhall gives certain statistics which will serve to make the comparison clear. On page 365 of his Dictionary of Statistics he says the total yearly product of the manufacturers of the world are £4,474,000,000, of which the United States produces £1,443,000,000.

I do not vouch, nor can anybody vouch, for these figures, but the proportion of one-third to two-thirds nobody can fairly dispute. We produce one-third, and the rest of the world, England included, two-thirds.

The population of the world is 1,500,000,000, of which we have 70,000,000 which leaves 1,430,000,000, for the rest of mankind. We use all our manufactures, or the equivalent of them. Hence we are equal to one-half the whole globe outside of ourselves, England included, and compared as a market with the rest of the world, our population is equal to about 70,000,000.

I repeat, as compared with England herself as a market our people are equivalent to 175-

000,000. As compared with the rest of the world, England included, we are equal as a market to 700,000,000.

Instead of increasing this market by leaving it to the steady increase of wages which the figures of the Aldrich report so conclusively show, and which have not only received the sanction of the member from New York, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Democratic Bureau of Statistics, but the sanction of everybody who hears me, our committee propose to lower wages and so lessen the market and then divide that market with somebody else, and all on the chance of getting the markets of the world.

Who have these markets of the world now? There is hardly a spot on the globe where three generations of Englishmen, Frenchmen, or Germans have not been camped in possession of every avenue of trade. Do you suppose that with machinery nearly as good as ours and wages at one-half these men are going to surrender to us the markets of the world? Why, the very duties you keep on show that you do not believe it. If we can not without duties hold our own markets, how shall we pay freight, and the expense of introducing goods, and meet the foreigner where he lives?

We were talking a while ago about higher wages. The question naturally comes up, How can these higher wages be got? There must be something for them to come from. Just think a moment what wages are. They are the de-

vourers of consumable wealth. In order to have more consumable wealth you must have an incentive for creation. Wealth will never be made unless a consumer stands ready. More consumable wealth, therefore, depends upon a broadening market. This I have already shown, does not mean more purchasers, but purchasers with better purses, tho, for that matter, in this country we have both.

But how can you make more wealth with the same number of workers? By using forces of nature and by utilizing human brains. How can you do that? By incentives. The brain no more works without incentive than the body does.

To hear the discussion in Congress you would suppose that invention dropped from heaven like manna to the Jews. You would suppose that James Watt reached out into the darkness and pulled back a steam engine. It was not so. All invention is the product of necessities and of pressure. When the boy who wanted to go off to play and so rigged the stopcocks that the engine went itself, he was not only a true inventor, but he had the same motive—his personal advantage—that all inventors have, and, like them, was urged on by business necessities.

What originated Bessemer steel? Sir Henry Bessemer? No; but the necessities of railroads, under public pressure for lower rates of traffic, which would every one of them have been bankrupt without steel rails. If Sir Henry had not invented the process somebody else would. It

detracts not one iota from the fame of Alexander Bell that a dozen men were close on his track. It has been so in every great invention. I say, therefore, that it was the diversification of our industries that has stimulated inventions. Otherwise all the inventive power of America would have run to waste; and when a man calculates the wonders of American inventive genius he knows where some of our wealth comes from. As a further proof that invention is born of necessity, tell me why great inventions never come until the world is in such shape as to enjoy them? What would the Crusaders have done with railroads? There was not money enough in the world to travel or merchandise to keep them going a week.

Here let me meet one other question, and let me meet it fairly. We are charged with having claimed that the tariff alone will raise wages, and we are pointed triumphantly to the fact that the wages of France and Germany, protected by a tariff, are lower than England, free of all tariff, and to America with a tariff and still higher wages. We have never made such a claim in any such form. Free-traders have set up that claim for us in order to triumphantly knock it over. What we do say is, that where two nations have equal skill and equal appliances and a market of nearly equal size, and one of them can hire labor at one-half less, nothing but a tariff can maintain higher wages, and that we can prove.

If there be two bales of goods side by side, made by the same kind of machinery and with the labor of human beings in both of the same degree of skill, and if the labor of one bale cost only half, for example, as much as the other, that other bale can never be sold until the extra cost of the costlier labor is squeezed out of it, provided there is an abundant supply of the product of the cheaper labor. If the bale with the cheaper labor of England in it meets the bale with the dearer labor of America in it, which will be bought at cost of production? I leave that problem just there. The sale of the English bale will be only limited by England's production.

Some men think, indeed, this bill and its author's speeches proceed upon the supposition that the first step toward gaining the markets of the world is to give up our own: just as if a fortified army, with enemies on all flanks, should overturn its own breastworks as the first preliminary to a march into the open. Even the foolish chivalry of the Marquis de Montcalm which led him to his death on the Heights of Abraham had not that crowning folly. Such is not the history of the world; such is not even the example of England. Tariff duties, whether levied for that purpose or for revenue, become a dead letter when we are able to compete with the outside world.

We are the only rival that England fears; for we alone have in our borders the population and

the wages, the raw material, and within ourselves the great market which insures to us the most improved machinery. Our constant power to increase our wages insures us also continuous progress. If you wish us to follow the example of England, I say yes, with all my heart, but her real example and nothing less. Let us keep protection, as she did, until no rival dares to invade our territory, and then we may take our chances for a future which by that time will not be unknown.

We know, my friends, that before this tribunal we all of us plead in vain. Why we fail, let those answer who read the touching words of Abraham Lincoln's first inaugural and remember that he pleaded with these same men and their predecessors. Where he failed we can not hope to succeed. But tho we fail here to-day, like our great leader of other days in the larger field before the mightier tribunal which will finally and for ever decide this question, we shall be more than conquerors; for this great nation, shaking off, as it has once before, the influence of a lower civilization, will go on to fulfil its high destiny, until over the South, as well as over the North, shall be spread the full measures of that amazing prosperity which is the wonder of the world.

CRISP

IN CLOSING THE WILSON TARIFF BILL DEBATE[1]

(1894)

Born in England in 1845, died in 1896; Lieutenant in the Confederate Army in the Civil War; served many years in Georgia as Solicitor General and Judge; five times elected to Congress; Speaker of the House in the 52d and 53d Congresses.

I ASSUME that the cause of protection has no more able advocate than the gentleman from Maine. I assume that the argument for protection can be put in no more alluring form than that to which we have listened to-day. So assuming, I shall ask you calmly and dispassionately to examine with me that argument, to see upon what it is based, and then I shall invoke the unprejudiced judgment of this House as to whether the cause attempted to be sustained by the gentleman from Maine has been sustained or can be before any tribunal where the voice of reason is heard or the sense of justice is felt.

The gentleman from Maine, with a facility that is unequaled, when he encounters an argument which he is unable to answer passes it by

[1] From his speech in the House of Representatives, February 1, 1894, in reply to Thomas B. Reed in closing the debate on this bill. Mr. Crisp was then Speaker of the House and Mr. Reed ex-Speaker.

with some bright and witty saying and thereby invites and receives the applause of those who believe as he does. But the gentleman does not attempt, the gentleman has not to-day attempted, to reply to the real arguments that are made in favor of freer trade and greater liberty of commerce.

The gentleman points to the progress of the United States, he points to the rate of wages in the United States, he points to the aggregated wealth of the United States, and claims all this as due to protection. But he does not explain how we owe these blessings to protection. He says, we have protection in the United States, wages are high in the United States therefore protection makes high wages.

When we ask the gentleman from Maine to give us a reason why a high-protective tariff increases the rate of wages he points to the glory, the prosperity, and the honor of our country. We on this side unite with him in every sentiment, in every purpose, in every effort that has for its object the advancement of the general welfare of the people of the United States, but we differ from him as to the method of promoting their welfare. The gentleman belongs to that school who believe that scarcity is a blessing, and that abundance should be prohibited by law. We belong to that school who believe that scarcity is a calamity to be avoided, and that abundance should be, if possible, encouraged by law.

The gentleman belongs to that class who believe that by a system of taxation we can make the country rich. He believes that it is possible by tax laws to advance the prosperity of all the industries and all the people in the United States. Either, Mr. Speaker, that statement is an absurdity upon its face, or it implies that in some way we have the power to make some persons not resident of the United States pay the taxes that we impose. I insist that you do not increase the taxable wealth of the United States when you tax a gentleman in Illinois and give the benefit of that tax to a gentleman in Maine. Such a course prevents the natural and honest distribution of wealth, but it does not create or augment it.

The gentleman from Maine and his associates, when dealing with a great question which must affect the business, the happiness, and the prosperity of all our people, make statements which are inconsistent with each other and are calculated to deceive; and yet the gentleman presumes to lecture this side of the House because, forsooth, we can not accept his conclusions thus arrived at.

But when we point to the impoverished farmers throughout the country, when we point to the strikes of laboring men for higher wages, when we point to the suspension of protected industries,—you say all this is due to threatened reduction of the tariff. You take credit that you are not entitled to, and you seek to avoid

responsibility for that which you are clearly and undeniably responsible.

Our friends of the minority say: The consumer will take care of himself, if you look after the producer; for he is one and the same individual.

The audacity of the statement is only equaled by the inconsistency of this whole report. Assuming, if you please, for the purposes of the argument, what these gentlemen claim, that a protective tariff gives higher wages in protected industries, and still your proposition is wholly without foundation. The consumer and the producer the same! Why, Mr. Speaker, do you know the proportion the producers or protected manufactured products in this country bear to the producers of all other products? You do not pretend that your tariff raises the price of the farmer's wheat, or his cotton, or his corn, or his meats; yet in spite of this great class, which is as three to one or more against the other, you gravely say that the producer and the consumer are the same!

Will you tell me how your protective tariff benefits the man who raises cotton, or corn, or wheat, or meats? The producers of those great staples are forced to seek their market abroad. A hundred years of this fostering system has not yet built up a home market for more than one-third of the cotton produced in the United States. Our market is abroad. Will you tell how this protective tariff benefits our agricul-

tural producers? I can show you—I think I can demonstrate clearly—how the tariff hurts them; and I defy any of you to show wherein they are benefited by a protective tariff.

Suppose a farmer in Minnesota has 5,000 bushels of wheat and a farmer in Georgia has 100 bales of cotton. That wheat at eighty cents a bushel is worth $4,000, and that cotton at eight cents a pound is worth $4,000. Let those producers ship their staples abroad. The Minnesota wheat-grower ships his wheat to Liverpool; whether he ships it there or not, that is where the price of his wheat is fixed. The Georgia cotton-raiser ships his cotton to Liverpool; whether he ships it there or not, that is where the price of his cotton is fixed. The wheat and the cotton are sold in that free trade market. The wheat is sold for $4,000; the cotton brings the same amount. The Minnesota farmer invests the $4,000 he has received for his wheat in clothing, crockeryware, iron, steel, dress goods, clothing,—whatever he may need for his family in Minnesota. The Georgia cotton-raiser invests the proceeds of his cotton in like kinds of goods.

Each of those men ships his goods to this country and they reach the port of New York. When either undertakes to unload them he is met by the collector of customs, who says, "Let me see your invoice." The invoice is exhibited, and it shows $4,000 worth of goods. Those goods represent in the one case 5,000 bushels of wheat, in the other case 100 bales of cotton.

The collector at the port says to either of these gentlemen—the man who raises the wheat in Minnesota or him who raises the cotton in Georgia, "You can not bring into this market those goods for which you have exchanged your products unless you pay to the United States a tariff by the McKinley law—a tax of $2,000!"

The man will in vain refer the collector to the statement of the gentleman from Maine that the foreigner pays the tax. You can not convince that unrighteous United States officer that the foreigner is to pay the sum of $2,000; he requires the Minnesota farmer or the Georgia farmer to pay it. What is the result? The goods that cost either of these men $4,000 without the tariff cost him $6,000 with it.

The American laboring man wants what? He wants steady employment at reasonable wages. This protective system builds up industries which it is wasteful upon the part of the manufacturer to carry on. It destroys the natural industries of the people, and builds up an artificial industry. It takes away the natural right of every individual freely to exchange the surplus of that which he makes for the surplus of that which his neighbor makes. His neighbor, my friends, is the world.

Trade is not war. Trade is peace. Commerce knows no nationality. There is not a manufacturer in the United States, however highly he might have been favored, who will not send his goods to India, if by so doing he can get a little

more for them than he can by selling them here; and he has the right to do it.

Gentlemen talk about a home market. What is a market? A market is where you buy and where you sell. If you say the market to which you allude is only that market in which I shall buy, then it is only half a market. A market is a place where you go to sell and where you go to buy. Restrictive protective tariff forces the American people to buy in the highest market on earth, and forces the great agricultural class which exports $700,000,000 worth of their products every year to sell in the cheapest markets on the earth.

When you tax that Minnesota farmer or that Georgia farmer 50 per cent. on what he seeks to bring in return for his own goods, you are diminishing the purchasing power of that which he sells, and you are inflicting an injury upon him to that extent.

But, say my friends on the other side, we want an American system. We want an American system, too; but we differ as to what constitutes the American system. The Democratic idea of an American system is the largest liberty of all the people consistent with the individual rights of every person.

The idea of our Republican friends of an American system is a Chinese wall that will force our people to trade with themselves, and not permit them to trade with anybody else. Let us not forget that the same wall that shuts

out the surplus products from foreign lands shuts in the surplus products that we make at home.

Let us bear in mind that if we do not sometimes buy from those to whom we ship our products they can not always buy from us. No man can always buy unless he can sometimes sell. The system fastened upon us by the Republican party is one that permits us to sell abroad, but does not permit those people to sell to us. We can deposit what we have there, we can exchange it for their goods, but when we bring them home we must pay a penalty to the American manufacturer because we have dared to exercise the liberty of an American freeman to buy where he pleases.

Whenever we have had an opportunity to go to the people upon this question they have been with us. The gentleman says for thirty years we have had protection. So we have, but for ten or fifteen years after the war the people were in no condition to discuss economic questions. The Republican party was then flushed with its great political victories. The people throughout the country were generally prejudiced against the South. Reason had not resumed its way, and when Democrats talked about a reduction in the tariff, our kind and loving friends on the other side said, "Oh, go to the polls and vote as you shot, against the South," and that ended it.

That is all there was of argument about it.

They continued making that statement to the people, and the people accepted it, and voted as they were told. They kept the Republicans in power, and that party, promising at every election to reduce the tariff whenever they got into power, again increased it. The Republicans have never been in power since the war that they have not increased the burdens put upon the people by the tariff system, yet I defy any Republican to show me an argument made by him before the people in favor of an increase of the tariff.

The people trusted them upon the idea that there would be a reduction; but just as soon as the party got into power, true to the principles which have governed them in these later days, they surrendered themselves bound hand and foot to the manufacturing interests of the country, and did what they were told by that interest to do.

If there is any man in America who really believes that in a republican form of government, where the people rule, where laws should be made for the good of all, that any party has a right to impose taxes or to put burdens upon one class in order to benefit another class, then, my friends, that man is unworthy of a place in the free country in which he lives. The Republicans of thirty years ago, so lauded by my friend from Maine, never advocated this tariff—never. Why, Mr. Speaker, the fathers of the protective

system never dreamed of such rates as those of the McKinley bill.

Our Republican friends tell us the laboring men should be independent. We agree to that. The great object and aim of the Democratic party is to contribute to the independence of the laboring men of this country. All classes of laboring men—the farmer in his field, the workingman in his shop, whether protected or unprotected, the carpenter, the blacksmith, and all of those people we desire to make independent; but we propose to do it by promoting abundance of everything that is necessary to sustain the lives of themselves and of their families. You can contribute most to the independence of man by furnishing him with a market where he can buy that which he needs cheapest. Then you make him most independent. He can then demand better wages than he can when the wolf is at the door; he can command better hours if he is able to get the necessities of life at reduced price; and he can command that natural freedom which all men desire, if he can feel that no unjust law taxes him to give to some petty favorite of a party in power.

For twenty years the party represented by this side of the House has been striving for power; and the great issue on which we have gone before the people was a reduction of taxation. We promised them everywhere that if they would intrust us with the power to do so we would reduce the burdens placed upon them by

unjust laws. After we get away from the period of prejudice of reason in which I hope we now exist, the people, after a full, fair, and free argument, intrusted us with the power to perform that work.

The question presented to us is this: Shall we redeem the pledges that we made to the people? Shall we reduce their taxes? Shall we reduce their burdens? We agree that we should. We have formulated a bill that does reduce them to a large extent; and when we do it we find, that the revenue is meager. The Democratic party stands pledged to redeem every promise the government has ever made to any class. And we do not propose to take any risks on this question. We propose to have an abundance of revenue to pay the expenses of the government economically administered; and we only ask accumulated wealth to contribute $30,000,000 in taxation to support the government which in turn protects them in everything they have.

Now, my party friends, my time is out and my strength is exhausted. We have all a great deal at stake in this matter. We must help each other. It will not do for a man to say simply because there are things in this bill which he does not approve, that therefore he will not support it. Let him weigh the one against the other, and my word for it, he will find when he is done that in the interest of the plain common people of the United States he will be constrained to waive any objections that he may

have to the bill and stand with the great body of his party in passing this substantial measure of relief.

We have not done in this bill all that we should. There may be and doubtless are errors in it, but it is a step in the right direction; and if we are not mistaken, when this step is taken, before the next step is proposed some of these protected manufacturers who are now standing boldly in the way of reform will be found in the forefront of those who want to do something more to enlarge and extend the commerce and production of the United States.

Let us stand together, let us pass this bill; let us redeem this pledge as we must and will redeem every other pledge that we have made to the people. And if, my friends, we can crystallize this bill into a law, while there may be here and there some monopolists or gentlemen of large wealth who will criticize and condemn us, yet all over the country, in the homes of the farmers, in the homes of the workers, and in the homes of the men employed in every industry in the United States, there will be rejoicing and happiness. Agriculture will be encouraged; manufactures will be aided; commerce will be revived; and thus we will promote the general welfare of all classes of our people.

SHERMAN

ON "THE CRIME OF 1873"[1]

(1895)

Born in 1823, died in 1900; elected to Congress from Ohio, 1855–61; United States Senator, 1861–77, and 1881–97; Secretary of the Treasury, 1877–81; Secretary of State, 1897–98.

When the Republican party came into power in 1861 by the election of Mr. Lincoln, it had to face a formidable rebellion. Gold and silver were alike banished from circulation, and irredeemable paper of all denominations from ten cents to $1,000 was substituted in place of coin. When the war was over the Republican party sought to restore specie payment as soon as practicable. In March, 1869, it pledged the faith of the nation to payment in coin, or its equivalent, of all bonds of the United States, and to redeem the United States notes at the earliest practical moment in coin.

In order to carry out this pledge it became necessary to revise the various coinage laws of the United States. This was promptly and very carefully done by a bill framed in the treasury department while Mr. Boutwell was secretary. It was thoroughly considered by the events of that department, and was printed and submitted

[1] From a speech before the Ohio Republican Convention on August 15, 1895.

to all persons in the United States who were supposed to be familiar with the coinage laws. The bill, containing sixty-seven sections, accompanied by a mass of information that fills a volume, was sent to Congress, April 25, 1870, by Secretary Boutwell, and its passage was strongly recommended by him.

This bill omitted from the coins of the United States the silver dollar, precisely as was done in 1853, but provided for the coinage of the fractional parts of the dollar in accordance with the act of that year. This bill was pending in Congress for three years, was carefully considered in both houses and special attention was called to the omission of the 412½ grains silver dollar, which was never in the bill at any stage, and the reason for this omission given. It was finally determined at the urgent request of members from the Pacific coast to insert among the silver coins a trade dollar containing 420 grains of standard silver; but this dollar was made, like the silver coins, a legal tender for $5 only. There was but one yea and nay vote on the bill, and that was on the proposition to repeal the charge made by the mints for the coinage of gold. I voted against this appeal.

The bill passed both houses and became a law February 12, 1873, by practically a unanimous vote of both parties, and was specially supported and voted for by the senators and members from the silver States. This has been called the "Crime of 1873," and as the bill was under my

charge in the Senate I was held to be the chief criminal. It was, in fact, a wise measure of public policy, carefully discussed and considered during three years.

When we test the outcry against this act with the sober facts shown by official records, it appears simply ludicrous. The total number of silver dollars coined from 1792 to 1853 was 8,031,238, while the number of trade dollars issued under the coinage act of 1873, containing 7½ grains more silver than the old dollar, was 35,965,924, and the number of standard silver dollars coined under the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 was 430,790,041, or fifty-four times the number issued before 1873.

It is strange that the very men who supported and urged this coinage law of 1873 and demanded the exclusive coinage of gold are the very men who now demand the free coinage of silver, and denounce as "goldites" and "robbers" all those who believe in the coinage of both gold and silver.

The question will never be settled until you determine the simple question whether the laboring man is entitled to have a good dollar, if he earns it, or whether you are going to cheat him with something else. That is the upshot of the whole thing. Everybody has to say that the laboring man was entitled to a good dollar. That was fought over. They will fight it over again, and the same party will win. There have been a great many battles fought against gold, but

gold has won every time. Gold never has compromised. Gold has made the world respect it all the time. The English people once thought they could get along without gold for a while, but they had to come back to it.

On June 1, 1874, Senators Jones and Stewart, and all the representatives and senators of the silver States, were urgent and honest in saying that gold was the best and only standard of value, but they changed their minds when the largely increased and increasing production of silver in Nevada and other States reduced the market value of silver below that of gold at the established ratio of 16 to 1. Then they wanted a market for their silver. They wanted to pay existing debts and obligations contracted upon the gold basis in silver, but took care in their contracts to stipulate for the payment of the gold to them, and this has been, and is now, the general practise in the silver States.

When the coinage law of 1873 was enacted all of the States except those on the Pacific coast conducted their business upon the basis of greenbacks or United States notes, then at a discount of about 13 per cent. Neither silver nor gold was used in domestic transactions, but we collected our customs duties in gold coin and conducted our foreign commerce in gold, the money of the world. It was not until January, 1875, that the first step was taken to resume specie payments, nor did we resume until January, 1879.

During this period silver rapidly fell in market value below gold at the ratio of 16 to 1. Prior and subsequent to 1873 many changes were made in coinage by the leading countries of the world. Germany, in 1812, changed its standard from silver to gold. France, Italy, Switzerland and Belgium had, in 1865, entered into a treaty called the Latin Union, to which other nations became parties, and by which the coins of each of these countries were received and paid out by all of them. This important arrangement was first modified, and finally abandoned and gold became the standard of value in those countries, but in all silver was coined and largely used as a subsidiary coin, precisely as in the United States.

In anticipation of the resumption of specie payments the Resumption Act of 1875 provided silver coins of dimes, quarters and half dollars for the redemption of the fractional currency then in general use in our country. The new silver coins gave great satisfaction. They were limited in legal tender qualities to $10. At this time Mr. Bland of Missouri, introduced his bill for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, on the demand of the holders of silver bullion. Silver had then declined below that ratio. One ounce of gold was worth more than 16 ounces of silver. The Bland bill, if it had become a law as it passed the House, would have demonetized gold. Such was not the purpose of Congress.

When the bill came to the Senate, an amendment was made on the motion of Senator Allison, who changed the scope of the bill and authorized and directed the secretary of the Treasury to purchase from time to time silver bullion at the market price, not less than $2,000,000, not more than $4,000,000 worth per month, and cause the same to be coined into silver dollars as fast as purchased. It also provided that any holder of the coin authorized by that act might deposit the same with the treasurer of the United States in sums not less than $10, and receive certificates therefor of not less than $10 each, and that the coin deposited should be retained in the Treasury for the payment of the certificates on demand. This bill so amended passed both houses. It was known as the Bland-Allison Act. It greatly added to the difficulties of resumption, and for that reason was vetoed by President Hayes, but became a law over his veto.

Under its provisions the United States purchased over 291,000,000 ounces of silver at the cost of $308,279,260. It was hoped that this enormous purchase would arrest the decline of silver, but in spite of it silver steadily declined in market value, and at the present price the loss to the government on the purchase of silver under this act amounts to over $100,000,000.

When Congress met in December, 1889, there was a strong desire in both Houses to utilize silver as legal tender money under conditions that would not demonetize gold. As the result of

long discussions in both Houses, and after a conference between them, a bill was passed July 14, 1890, by which the secretary of the Treasury was directed to purchase from time to time silver bullion to the aggregate of 4,500,000 ounces a month at the market price and to issue in payment of such purchases treasury notes of the United States, which were made a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, and were redeemable by the secretary of the Treasury in gold or silver coin at his discretion. This measure, it was thought, would arrest the decline in the market value of silver and enable the secretary to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other at the ratio of 16 to 1. But the market value of silver continued to decline. The government purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, 168,000,000 ounces at a cost of $156,000,000.

When we contemplate the great amount of debt and credit that is unavoidable in a vast but new country like ours, we naturally shrink from any measure that will either rob the lender or do injustice to the borrower. It is impossible to estimate the wrong and injustice that will be done to creditors by the selling of nearly one-half of the debts due them.

The very threat to do it will lead to the prompt and harsh collection of debts before free coinage can become a law. I am advised that already debts that would have remained uncalled for have, in fear of such a law, been enforced. It

is certain that before a free coinage bill can become a law the wide distrust caused by the pending of such a measure will lead to the rapid collection of debts, the sacrifice of property and deepen existing financial difficulties growing out of insufficient revenues for the nation as well as for any state government.

It is sometimes said of creditors that they are bloodthirsty Shylocks, aristocrats, blood-suckers, extortioners. It may be that there are among money-lenders some men who merit these epithets, but the great body of creditors of our country are among the thrifty, industrious and intelligent men and women of every community. One great body of creditors here is the 970,000 Union soldiers, their widows and orphans, who are creditors of the United States to the amount of over $140,000,000 a year for services and sacrifices in the Union army. It would be an act of perfidy and meanness beyond expression for this great country to pay them with the money of less purchasing power than gold coin, merely because the overproduction of silver in the United States has reduced the market value of silver bullion contained in a silver dollar. To take advantage of this decline in order to reduce the value of the pittance to these pensioners is worse than to rob the graves of the dead.

There is another class of creditors that the free coinage of silver will greatly injure. It is the depositors in savings institutions and kindred organizations, who, according to official

statistics, number nearly 5,000,000 people, and whose deposits amount to more than $1,800,000,000. Will you cheat them by reducing the value and purchasing power of the dollar they have deposited?

Free coinage will also wipe out nearly one-half the value of life insurance, which provident people of the United States have paid to secure in case of death some support and protection to wife and children. It will affect the multitude of clerks and employees who depend upon monthly pay, and will reduce the purchasing power of all salaries of officers and employees in the United States, and of every State, county, city or township in this broad land. But by far the greatest injury resulting from the free coinage of silver will fall upon workingmen. Their wages are now based upon money of the highest value, upon gold coin of standard value. Under free coinage of silver the value of the silver dollar will fall to fifty-three cents in gold, or, as I have already said, the hundred cents of the gold dollar will be worth 194 cents of the silver dollar.

The struggle between workingmen and employer will then commence, and no one knows better than the workingman how difficult it is to get an advance in pay. We have strikes and strife enough now, when the workingman gets his pay in gold coin or its equivalent. but what will be the condition when he is paid in cheaper money of the same nominal amount, but of less

purchasing power? Every sentiment of justice will be on the side of the workingman in his struggle for good money or increased wages in cheap money.

I have the confident hope that the great body of the Republican and Democratic parties, representing the conservative elements of our people, will stamp their rebuke upon this measure of infamy and thus preserve intact the honor, the credit and glory of our great country. This matter of the free coinage of silver and the degredation of the standard of value involves not only questions of money, but of honor and good faith. When their honor is involved the people never fail to respond. They have complied with every promise and paid every debt contracted since the organization of the national government as it became due. They have paid four-fifths of the debts contracted during the Civil War, and the prospect was hopeful that all of it would be paid before the close of the century, but this reversing our standards of value has, like the fire bell at night, startled and alarmed our people.

ALTGELD

ON MUNICIPAL AND GOVERNMENTAL OWNERSHIP[1]

(1897)

Born in 1847, died in 1902; entered the Union army at the age of sixteen; Judge of the Superior Court of Chicago, 1886–1891; Governor of Illinois, 1893–97, when he pardoned three anarchists; advanced the cause of prison reform.

ASIDE from the money question, the most serious problem that confronts the people of America to-day is that of rescuing their cities, their States and the federal government, including the federal judiciary, from absolute control of corporate monopoly. How to restore the voice of the citizen in the government of his country; and how to put an end to those proceedings in some of the higher courts which are farce and mockery on one side, and a criminal usurpation and oppression on the other.

Corporations that were to be servants and begged the privilege of supplying cities with conveniences, or of serving the country at large, have become masters.

We have had thirty years of colorless politics in which both of the political parties were simply conveniences for organized greed. There was

[1] From a speech in Philadelphia on Labor Day, September 5, 1897.

nothing to arouse the deep, slumbering patriotism of the masses and a race of politicians came to the front, most of whom had no convictions and many of whom straddled every proposition and then waited to be seduced. They were men who made every promise to the laborer, and then betrayed him. These men became the instruments through which the corporations worked.

Having learned what vast sums can be extorted from the American people, the monopolies used a part of the wealth they got from this source to corrupt the people's representatives, and thus obtained unlimited privileges of plunder, until almost every great city in this country is tied and gagged, and can not even enter a protest while being robbed. All of this falls with crushing force on the laborer, for his hands must earn the taxes the landlord pays—he is forced to depend on the public conveniences, and always suffers under bad government. An individual rarely has interest enough or money enough, to bribe a city council or buy a legislature. But the corporations have both, and, as the money all comes off the public, they offer temptations that are too strong for the average man to resist.

In as much as no government can endure in which corrupt greed not only makes the laws, but decides who shall construe them, many of our best citizens are beginning to despair of the republic. Others urge that we should remove the bribe-givers—that is, destroy this overwhelm-

ing temptation by having the government take all these monopolies itself and furnish the service which they now furnish, and thus not only save our institutions, but have the great profits which now go into the pockets of private corporations turned into the public treasury.

But the corruptionists, the monopolists, and all men who are fattening on the existing rottenness and injustice, cry angrily, "Why, that would be socialism, rank socialism, and we are opposed to it!" Some of these men know the meaning of socialism and some do not, but they control all those men who cling to the skirts of wealth.

Socialism has been as a system of government in which the competitive system is entirely abolished and the principle of associated effort is applied to everything. According to the standard authorities, socialism is an ideal state founded on justice, and in which the benefits of modern invention and of monopoly shall be shared by all the people instead of being controlled by the few and used by these few to make themselves the absolute masters of the many. The word "socialism" is used as a term of derision only by the ignorant or the servile.

During the former administration of Lord Salisbury as premier of England it was once charged that the tendency of the government was socialistic; that there was a tendency for the government to do those things which always had been left, and should be left, to the individual;

that most of the great cities of the Empire had not only assumed the functions of supplying their inhabitants with water, gas, electric light and street railway service, but that they were going a great deal farther and were even building and renting houses and doing a host of other things that were not within the province of government.

He was reported as saying in answer to this criticism, that it was not a question of socialism at all, but simply a question of business; a question whether a given community can secure certain advantages or in a more satisfactory manner when acting collectively, than by leaving everything to individual effort; that a collective body has the same right to pursue the best business methods, and do all things necessary to its welfare, or the welfare of its members, that an individual has; that the best interest of the community must be the criterion by which to decide each case; that there was a time when private individuals carried mails and charged what they pleased, there being no government postoffice; but as the world advanced, every government took the postal business into its own hands, and no intelligent man would have turned it over to a private corporation.

Let us see what civilized man is doing elsewhere. Take the cities of Great Britain first, for they have the same power of self-government that American cities have. In all that pertains to the comfort and enterprise of the individual

we are far in the lead; but in the government of cities we are far behind. Glasgow has to-day nearly one million inhabitants and is one of the great manufacturing and commercial cities of the world. Thirty years ago there was scarcely a city that was in a worse condition. Private corporations furnished it a poor quality of water, taken from the Clyde River, and they charged high rates for it. The city drained into the Clyde, and it became horribly filthy. Private corporations furnished a poor quality of gas, at a high price; and private companies operated the street railroads. Private companies had the same grip on the people there that they have in most American cities. Owing to the development of great shipbuilding and other industries in the valley of the Clyde, the laboring population of Glasgow became very dense and the means of housing the people were miserable. Poorly lighted, poorly ventilated, filthy houses brought high rents. In many cases two families lived in one room. Cleanliness was impossible; the sanitary conditions were frightful and the death rate was high. As for educational facilities, there were none worth mentioning for these people. The condition of the laboring classes was one of degradation and misery; children were growing up mentally, morally and physically diseased; a generation was coming which threatened to be an expense and a menace to the country. It was a great slum city.

But patriotic and public-spirited men came to

the front and gave the city the benefit of their services free. In fact, none of the highest city officials in Great Britain received any pay other than the well being of humanity and the good opinions of their country. The city rid itself of the private companies by buying them and then brought fresh water from the highlands, a distance of sixty miles. It doubled the quantity of water furnished the inhabitants, and reduced the cost to consumers by one-half. And yet the department now yields over $200,000 a year net income over all fixed charges.

The municipality, after much difficulty, bought the private gas plants and gradualy reduced the price of gas from $1.14 to 58 cents, and it now illuminates not only the streets and public places, but all passageways and stairways in flat buildings, experience having shown that a good lamp is almost as useful as a policeman. The total debt of the city for plants, extensions, etc., to perfectly illumine all the city had reached nearly five and a half millions of dollars. Notwithstanding the low price at which gas is sold, this sum has gradually been reduced to less than two and a half millions of dollars out of the earnings of the system, and it will soon be wiped out and the entire revenue go into the city treasury.

The street railways were owned by the city, but, until 1894, they were leased out under an arrangement which paid the city full cost of construction, with interest, besides a yearly in-

come of $750 per street mile. In 1894 the city began to operate the lines itself. The fares were reduced 33 per cent., besides special tickets to laborers, so that the average is under two cents, and over one-third of all fares are one cent each.

The private company had worked its men twelve and fourteen hours a day and paid irregular and unsatisfactory wages. The city at once reduced the number of hours to ten, and fixed a satisfactory scale of wages. And, compared with what it formerly was, the service has been greatly improved. In spite of all these acts for the benefit of the public, the roads which had cost the city nothing, now net over all charges for improvements, etc., one-fourth of a million annually. In 1892 the city bought out a private electric light company, and now has the monopoly of furnishing electric light and power. This promises to be a source of enormous revenue for the city.

For sanitary reasons, the city built a number of public wash-houses, with all modern conveniences, so that a woman living in a small apartment can take a basketful of clothes to a public wash-house and for four cents an hour can have a stall and use all the machinery for washing and drying, and at the end of an hour take her basket of clothes home, washed and dried. For the same reasons, public baths and parks or pleasure grounds were established; and the city condemned a large amount of poor tenement property and tore the houses down and built whole

rows of apartments, airy and well lighted, which it now rents to laborers, and which, in time, will pay for themselves and will then be a great source of revenue.

The city had become filled with cheap lodging houses which were overcrowded and were filthy and prolific of both disease and crime. On sanitary and police grounds combined, the municipality built a number of airy and well-lighted lodging houses, some for men and some for women, where, for from six to nine cents, a person can get a bed in a small, seperate room, with the use of a large sitting room and the privilege of cooking his own food at the kitchen range.

The city has acquired all the docks and dock privileges and furnishes all the labor in managing them. It also has the exclusive ownership of all the markets and slaughter-houses and derives a large income from them.

Instead of draining into the Clyde, large works have been established, in which the solid matter is all taken out of the sewage and is pressed into cakes and loaded automatically on cars and then taken to the country, where it is used as manure on a farm belonging to the city, and where all the food for the city's horses is raised, while the liquid sewage is run through filtering beds and made clear and odorless.

Manchester has within its narrow limits only a little over half a million people, but within a radius of twenty miles from her city hall there are over three million inhabitants. These have

to be considered in discussing Manchester, which is essentially a manufacturing and commercial city. Its history is in many respects a parallel of that of Glasgow. It seemed to be a great city of slums, degradation and misery, and was in the grip of private monopolies.

To-day the city furnishes all the service that is furnished here by private corporations, and does it at about one-half cost. It furnishes gas at fifty-six cents a thousand, and after deducting all that is used to perfectly illuminate the streets and after applying $200,000 a year on the original cost of plants, etc., it still turns $300,000 a year into the public treasury, altho the aim in nearly all English cities is not to make money, but to serve the public.

The city constructed an aqueduct ninety miles to secure pure water and furnishes this for a little more than half what the private company had charged for a poor quality of water. It owns the street railways, and besides giving greatly reduced rates and giving half-fare tickets to workingmen, the city derives a large revenue from this source. Like Glasgow and Birmingham, the city owns large cemeteries in which there are separate sections for the different religious denominations, and prices are so arranged that while those who desire to do so can get lots costing from ten to thirty dollars, yet "a decent burial with inscription on stone over a grave can be had at about four dollars for adults and three dollars for children. This charge includes all cemetery fees and expenses."

The city owns the markets and slaughter-houses. It has provided parks and swimming baths and, like Birmingham and Glasgow, it maintains large technical schools in which thousands of young men are instructed in the industrial arts and sciences, so as to be able to maintain Manchester's greatness.

Birmingham has over half a million of people, and its experience resembles that of Glasgow and Manchester. Formerly private corporations controlled almost everything and charged very high rates for very poor service, and the sanitary conditions were frightful. But here again municipal statesmen came to the front, the most prominent among whom was the Honorable Joseph Chamberlain, who has since been in the British government. He gave his time free and was three times elected mayor. Under his guidance the gas works were purchased of the private companies for $10,000,000. There are about two thousand men employed in connection with the gas works; they work only eight hours a day; the price of gas has been reduced to fifty-eight cents; the streets have been better lighted than ever before; and the net amount now annually turned into the city treasury, after deducting all fixed charges, is over $300,000.

The water-works were purchased of the private companies for $6,750,000. The system was greatly extended, the supply doubled and the cost to consumers very much reduced.

This city has condemned the worst section of

the slums and thus acquired the ground at a cost of about $8,000,000, and upon this ground it has built modern houses which it rents, and the death rate in the section has been reduced from an average of eighty to the thousand persons down to an average of twenty, and it has now been demonstrated that in the end this property will pay for itself and thereafter go far toward defraying the annual expenses of the city.

Not going further into detail, let me say there are at present in the United Kingdom 185 municipalities that supply their inhabitants with water, with gas and electric light, and one-third of the street railway mileage of Great Britain is owned by the municipalities. Leaving out London, it amounts to two-thirds. And in most instances in which they do not own the street railways, they have compelled the companies to grant low fares and divide profits.

While these things are taking place in Europe the private corporations in America are bribing legislatures and city councils, reducing wages, charging higher rates, and collecting dividends on millions and millions of watered stock. According to legislative investigation, the stock in the Boston Street Railroad is over half water; in New York, in Brooklyn and in Philadelphia the ratio is 4 to 1.

Every business reason applicable to the municipalities and governments of Europe is applicable here. We want as pure water, as good

drainage, as cheap service as they have, and we want the same privilege of supplying ourselves as they exercise; and when it is apparent that, by acting collectively, we can do business more successfully, can serve ourselves better in every way, and can secure for the public treasury these millions which now go into the pockets of grasping individuals, have we not a right to do it? If we find that, in this manner, we can give steadiness to labor, and can elevate its standard and improve the conditions of all our people, dare we not do it? Every one of the reforms carried out in England and on the continent met with fierce opposition from the same classes that oppose them here, but the business sense and patriotic impulse of the people prevailed, and I believe, will prevail here.

HOAR

SUBJUGATION OF THE PHILIPPINES INIQUITOUS[1]

(1902)

Born in 1826, died in 1904; Member of Congress from Massachusetts in 1869–77; Member of the Electoral Commission in 1877; United States Senator from 1877 until his death.

We have to deal with a territory ten thousand miles away, twelve hundred miles in extent, containing ten million people. A majority of the Senate think that people are under the American flag and lawfully subject to our authority. We are not at war with them or with anybody. The country is in a condition of profound peace as well as of unexampled prosperity. The world is in a profound peace, except in one quarter, in South Africa, where a handful of republicans are fighting for their independence, and have been doing better fighting than has been done on the face of the earth since Thermopylæ, or certainly since Bannockburn.

You are fighting for sovereignty. You are fighting for the principle of eternal dominion over that people, and that is the only question in issue in the conflict. We said in the case of Cuba that she had a right to be free and inde-

[1] From a speech in the United States Senate in May, 1902.

pendent. We affirmed in the Teller resolution, I think without a negative voice, that we would not invade that right and would not meddle with her territory or anything that belonged to her. That declaration was a declaration of peace as well as of righteousness; and we made the treaty, so far as concerned Cuba, and conducted the war and have conducted ourselves ever since on that theory—that we had no right to interfere with her independence; that we had no right to her territory or to anything that was Cuba's. So we only demanded in the treaty that Spain should hereafter let her alone. If you had done to Cuba as you have done to the Philippine Islands, who had exactly the same right, you would be at this moment, in Cuba, just where Spain was when she excited the indignation of the civilized world and we compelled her to let go. And if you had done in the Philippines as you did in Cuba, you would be to-day or would soon be in those islands as you are in Cuba.

But you made a totally different declaration about the Philippine Islands. You undertook in the treaty to acquire sovereignty over her for yourself, which that people denied. You declared not only in the treaty, but in many public utterances in this Chamber and elsewhere, that you had a right to buy sovereignty with money, or to treat it as the spoils of war or the booty of battle. The moment you made that declaration the Filipino people gave you notice that they treated it as a declaration of war. So your gen-

erals reported, and so Aguinaldo expressly declared. In stating this account of profit and loss I hardly know which to take up first, principles and honor, or material interests—I should have known very well which to have taken up first down to three years ago—what you call the sentimental, the ideal, the historical on the right side of the column; the cost or the profit in honor or shame and in character and in principle and moral influence, in true national glory; or the practical side, the cost in money and gain, in life and health, in wasted labor, in diminished national strength, or in prospects of trade and money getting.

What has been the practical statesmanship which comes from your ideals and your sentimentalities. You have wasted nearly six hundred millions of treasure. You have sacrificed nearly ten thousand American lives—the flower of our youth. You have devastated provinces. You have slain uncounted thousands of the people you desire to benefit. You have established reconcentration camps. Your generals are coming home from their harvest bringing sheaves with them, in the shape of other thousands of sick and wounded and insane to drag out miserable lives, wrecked in body and mind. You make the American flag in the eyes of a numerous people the emblem of sacrilege in Christian churches, and of the burning of human dwellings, and of the horror of the water torture. Your practical statesmanship which disdains to

take George Washington and Abraham Lincoln or the soldiers of the Revolution or of the Civil War as models, has looked in some cases to Spain for your example. I believe—nay, I know—that in general our officers and soldiers are humane. But in some cases they have carried on your warfare with a mixture of American ingenuity and Castilian cruelty.

Your practical statesmanship has succeeded in converting a people who three years ago were ready to kiss the hem of the garment of the American and to welcome him as a liberator, who thronged after your men when they landed on those islands with benediction and gratitude, into sullen and irreconciliable enemies, possessed of a hatred which centuries can not eradicate.

The practical statesmanship of the Declaration of Independence and the Golden Rule would have cost nothing but a few kind words. They would have bought for you the great title of liberator and benefactor, which your fathers won for your country in the South American Republics and in Japan, and which you have won in Cuba. They would have bought for you undying gratitude of a great and free people and the undying glory which belongs to the name of liberator. That people would have felt for you as Japan felt for you when she declared last summer that she owed everything to the United States of America.

What have your ideals cost you, and what have they bought for you?

1. For the Philippine Islands you have had to repeal the Declaration of Independence.

For Cuba you had to reaffirm it and give it new luster.

2. For the Philippine Islands you have had to convert the Monroe Doctrine into a doctrine of mere selfishness.

For Cuba you have acted on it and vindicated it.

3. In Cuba you have got the eternal gratitude of a free people.

In the Philippine Islands you have got the hatred and sullen submission of a subjugated people.

4. From Cuba you have brought home nothing but glory.

From the Philippines you have brought home nothing of glory.

5. In Cuba no man thinks of counting the cost. The few soldiers who came home from Cuba wounded or sick carry about their wounds and their pale faces as if they were medals of honor. What soldier glories in a wound or an empty sleeve which he got in the Philippines?

6. The conflict in the Philippines has cost you six hundred million dollars, thousands of American soldiers—the flower of your youth—the health and sanity of thousands more, and hundreds of thousands of Filipinos slain.

Another price we have paid as the result of your practical statesmanship. We have sold out the right, the old American right, to speak out

the sympathy which is in our hearts for people who are desolate and oppressed everywhere on the face of the earth.

This war, if you call it war, has gone on for three years. It will go on in some form for three hundred years, unless this policy be abandoned. You will undoubtedly have times of peace and quiet, or pretended submission. You will buy men with titles, or office, or salaries. You will intimidate cowards. You will get pretended and fawning submission. The land will smile and seem at peace. But the volcano will be there. The lava will break out again. You can never settle this thing until you settle it right.

Gentlemen tell us that the Filipinos are savages, that they have inflicted torture, that they have dishonored our dead and outraged the living. That very likely may be true. Spain said the same thing of the Cubans. We have made the same charges against our own countrymen in the disturbed days after the war. The reports of committees and the evidence in the documents in our library are full of them. But who ever heard before of an American gentleman, or an American, who took as a rule for his own conduct the conduct of his antagonist, or who claimed that the Republic should act as savages because she had savages to deal with? I had supposed, Mr. President, that the question, whether a gentleman shall lie or murder or torture, depended on his sense of his own character, and not on his opinion of his victim. Of all the

miserable sophistical shifts which have attended this wretched business from the beginning, there is none more miserable than this.

Mr. President, this is the eternal law of human nature. You may struggle against it, you may try to escape it, you may persuade yourself that your intentions are benevolent, that your yoke will be easy and your burden will be light, but it will assert itself again. Government without the consent of the government—an authority which heaven never gave—can only be supported by means which heaven never can sanction.

The American people have got this one question to answer. They may answer it now; they can take ten years, or twenty years, or a generation, or a century to think of it. But it will not down. They must answer it in the end: Can you lawfully buy with money, or get by brute force of arms, the right to hold in subjugation an unwilling people, and to impose on them such constitution as you, and not they, think best for them.

We have answered this question a good many times in the past. The fathers answered it in 1776, and founded the Republic upon their answer, which has been the corner-stone. John Quincy Adams and James Monroe answered it again in the Monroe doctrine, which John Quincy Adams declared was only the doctrine of the consent of the governed. The Republican party answered it when it took possession of the force of government at the beginning of the most bril-

liant period in all legislative history. Abraham Lincoln answered it when, on that fatal journey to Washington in 1861, he announced that the doctrine of his political creed, and declared, with prophetic vision, that he was ready to be assassinated for it if need be. You answered it again yourselves when you said that Cuba, who had no more title than the people of the Philippine Islands had to their independence, of right ought to be free and independent.

The question will be answered again hereafter. It will be answered soberly and deliberately and quietly as the American people are wont to answer great questions of duty. It will be answered, not in any turbulent assembly, amid shouting and clapping of hands and stamping of feet, where men do their thinking with their heels and not with their brains. It will be answered in the churches and in the schools and in the colleges; and it will be answered in fifteen million American homes; and it will be answered as it has always been answered. It will be answered right.

HAY

HIS TRIBUTE TO McKINLEY[1]

(1903)

Born in 1838, died in 1905; Private Secretary to Lincoln in 1861-65; Secretary of Legation in Paris in 1865–67; Chargé d'Affairs in Vienna in 1867–68; Secretary of Legation in Madrid in 1668–70; Assistant Secretary of State in 1879–81; Ambassador to England in 1897–98; Secretary of State in 1898–1905.

For the third time the Congress of the United States are assembled to commemorate the life and the death of a president slain by the hand of an assassin. The attention of the future historian will be attracted to the features which reappear with startling sameness in all three of these awful crimes: the uselessness, the utter lack of consequence of the act; the obscurity, the insignificance of the criminal; the blamelessness—so far as in our sphere of existence the best of men may be held blameless—of the victim. Not one of our murdered presidents had an enemy in the world; they were all of such preeminent purity of life that no pretext could be given for the attack of passional crime; they were all men of democratic instincts, who could never have offended the most jealous advocates of equality; they were of kindly and generous nature, to

[1] From his memorial address at a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives on February 27, 1903.

whom wrong or injustice was impossible; of moderate fortune, whose slender means nobody could envy. They were men of austere virtue, of tender heart, of eminent abilities, which they had devoted with single minds to the good of the Republic. If ever men walked before God and man without blame, it was these three rulers of our people. The only temptation to attack their lives offered was their gentle radiance,—to eyes hating the light, that was offence enough.

The stupid uselessness of such an infamy affronts the common sense of the world. One can conceive how the death of a dictator may change the political conditions of an empire; how the extinction of a narrowing line of kings may bring in an alien dynasty. But in a well-ordered Republic like ours the ruler may fall, but the State feels no tremor. Our beloved and revered leader is gone—but the natural process of our laws provides us a successor, identical in purpose and ideals, nourished by the same teachings, inspired by the same principles, pledged by tender affection as well as by high loyalty to carry to completion the immense task committed to his hands, and to smite with iron severity every manifestation of that hideous crime which his mild predecessor, with his dying breath, forgave. The sayings of celestial wisdom have no date; the words that reach us, over two thousand years, out of the darkest hour of gloom the world has ever known, are true to life to-day: "They know not what they do." The blow struck at

our dear friend and ruler was as deadly as blind hate could make it; but the blow struck at anarchy was deadlier still.

How many countries can join with us in the community of a kindred sorrow! I will not speak of those distant regions where assassination enters into the daily life of government. But among the nations bound to us by the ties of familiar intercourse—who can forget that wise and mild autocrat who had earned the proud title of the liberator? that enlightened and magnanimous citizen whom France still mourns? that brave and chivalrous king of Italy who only lived for his people? and, saddest of all, that lovely and sorrowing empress, whose harmless life could hardly have excited the animosity of a demon? Against that devilish spirit nothing avails,—neither virtue nor patriotism, nor age nor youth, nor conscience nor pity. We can not even say that education is a sufficient safeguard against this baleful evil,—for most of the wretches whose crimes have so shocked humanity in recent years were men not unlettered, who have gone from the common schools, through murder to the scaffold.

The life of William McKinley was, from his birth to his death, typically American. There is no environment, I should say, anywhere else in the world which could produce just such a character. He was born into that way of life which elsewhere is called the middle class, but which in this country is so nearly universal as

to make of other classes an almost negligible quantity. He was neither rich nor poor, neither proud nor humble; he knew no hunger he was not sure of satisfying, no luxury which could enervate mind or body. His parents were sober, God-fearing people; intelligent and upright, without pretension and without humility. He grew up in the company of boys like himself, wholesome, honest, self-respecting. They looked down on nobody; they never felt it possible they could be looked down upon. Their houses were the homes of probity, piety, patriotism. They learned in the admirable school readers of fifty years ago the lessons of heroic and splendid life which have come down from the past. They read in their weekly newspapers the story of the world's progress, in which they were eager to take part, and of the sins and wrongs of civilization with which they burned to do battle. It was a serious and thoughtful time. The boys of that day felt dimly, but deeply, that days of sharp struggle and high achievement were before them. They looked at life with the wondering yet resolute eyes of a young esquire in his vigil of arms. They felt a time was coming when to them should be addressed the stern admonition of the Apostle, "Quit you like men; be strong."

The men who are living to-day and were young in 1860 will never forget the glory and glamor that filled the earth and the sky when the long twilight of doubt and uncertainty was ending and the time for action had come. A speech by

Abraham Lincoln was an event not only of high moral significance, but of far-reaching importance; the drilling of a militia company by Ellsworth attracted national attention; the fluttering of the flag in the clear sky drew tears from the eyes of young men. Patriotism, which had been a rhetorical expression, became a passionate emotion, in which instinct, logic and feeling were fused. The country was worth saving; it could be saved only by fire; no sacrifice was too great; the young men of the country were ready for the sacrifice; come weal, come woe, they were ready.

At seventeen years of age William McKinley heard this summons of his country. He was the sort of youth to whom a military life in ordinary times would possess no attractions. His nature was far different from that of the ordinary soldier. He had other dreams of life, its prizes and pleasures, than that of marches and battles. But to his mind there was no choice or question. The banner floating in the morning breeze was the beckoning gesture of his country. The thrilling notes of the trumpet called him—him and none other—into the ranks. His portrait in his first uniform is familiar to you all—the short, stocky figure; the quiet, thoughtful face; the deep, dark eyes. It is the face of a lad who could not stay at home when he thought he was needed in the field. He was of the stuff of which good soldiers are made. Had he been ten years older he would have entered at the head of a company and come out at the head of a division.

But he did what he could. He enlisted as a private; he learned to obey. His serious, sensible ways, his prompt, alert efficiency soon attracted the attention of his superiors. He was so faithful in little things that they gave him more and more to do. He was untiring in camp and on the march; swift, cool and fearless in fight. He left the army with field rank when the war ended, brevetted by President Lincoln for gallantry in battle.

In coming years when men seek to draw the moral of our great Civil War, nothing will seem to them so admirable in all the history of our two magnificent armies as the way in which the war came to a close. When the Confederate army saw the time had come, they acknowledged the pitiless logic of facts and ceased fighting. When the army of the Union saw it was no longer needed, without a murmur or question, making no terms, asking no return, in the flush of victory and fulness of might, it laid down its arms and melted back into the mass of peaceful citizens. There is no event since the nation was born which has so proved its solid capacity for self-government. Both sections share equally in that crown of glory. They had held a debate of incomparable importance and had fought it out with equal energy. A conclusion had been reached—and it is to the everlasting honor of both sides that they each knew when the war was over and the hour of a lasting peace had struck. We may admire the desperate daring of others who prefer anni-

hilation to compromise, but the palm of common sense, and, I will say, of enlightened patriotism, belongs to the men like Grant and Lee, who knew when they had fought enough for honor and for country.

So it came naturally about that in 1876—the beginning of the second century of the Republic—he began, by an election to Congress, his political career. Thereafter for fourteen years this chamber was his home. I use the word advisedly. Nowhere in the world was he so in harmony with his environment as here; nowhere else did his mind work with such full consciousness of its powers. The air of debate was native to him; here he drank delight of battle with his peers. In after days, when he drove by this stately pile, or when on rare occasions his duty called him here, he greeted his old haunts with the affectionate zest of a child of the house; during all the last ten years of his life, filled as they were with activity and glory, he never ceased to be homesick for this hall. When he came to the presidency, there was not a day when his congressional service was not of use to him. Probably no other president has been in such full and cordial communion with Congress, if we may except Lincoln alone. McKinley knew the legislative body thoroughly, its composition, its methods, its habit of thought. He had the profoundest respect for its authority and an inflexible belief in the ultimate rectitude of its purposes. Our history shows how sure an executive

courts disaster and ruin by assuming an attitude of hostility or distrust to the Legislature; and, on the other hand, McKinley's frank and sincere trust and confidence in Congress were repaid by prompt and loyal support and cooperation. During his entire term of office this mutual trust and regard—so essential to the public welfare—was never shadowed by a single cloud.

When he came to the presidency he confronted a situation of the utmost difficulty, which might well have appalled a man of less serene and tranquil self-confidence. There had been a state of profound commercial and industrial depression from which his friends had said his election would relieve the country. Our relations with the outside world left much to be desired. The feeling between the Northern and Southern sections of the Union was lacking in the cordiality which was necessary to the welfare of both. Hawaii had asked for annexation and had been rejected by the preceding administration. There was a state of things in the Caribbean which could not permanently endure. Our neighbor's house was on fire, and there were grave doubts as to our rights and duties in the premises. A man either weak or rash, either irresolute or headstrong, might have brought ruin on himself and incalculable harm to the country.

The least desirable form of glory to a man of his habitual mood and temper—that of successful war—was nevertheless conferred upon him by uncontrollable events. He felt it must

come; he deplored its necessity; he strained almost to breaking his relations with his friends, in order, first to prevent and then to postpone it to the latest possible moment. But when the die was cast, he labored with the utmost energy and ardor, and with an intelligence in military matters which showed how much of the soldier still survived in the mature statesman, to push forward the war to a decisive close. War was an anguish to him; he wanted it short and conclusive. His merciful zeal communicated itself to his subordinates, and the war, so long dreaded, whose consequences were so momentous, ended in a hundred days.

Mr. McKinley was reelected by an overwhelming majority. There had been little doubt of the result among well-informed people, but when it was known, a profound feeling of relief and renewal of trust were evident among the leaders of capital and industry, not only in this country, but everywhere. They felt that the immediate future was secure, and that trade and commerce might safely push forward in every field of effort and enterprise.

He felt that the harvest time was come, to garner in the fruits of so much planting and culture, and he was determined that nothing he might do or say should be liable to the reproach of a personal interest. Let us say frankly he was a party man; he believed the policies advocated by him and his friends counted for much in the country's progress and prosperity. He

hoped in his second term to accomplish substantial results in the development and affirmation of those policies. I spent a day with him shortly before he started on his fateful journey to Buffalo. Never had I seen him higher in hope and patriotic confidence. He was gratified to the heart that we had arranged a treaty which gave us a free hand in the Isthmus. In fancy he saw the canal already built and the argosies of the world passing through it in peace and amity. He saw in the immense evolution of American trade the fulfilment of all his dreams, the reward of all his labors. He was, I need not say, an ardent protectionist, never more sincere and devoted than during those last days of his life. He regarded reciprocity as the bulwark of protection —not a breach, but a fulfilment of the law. The treaties which for four years had been preparing under his personal supervision he regarded as ancillary to the general scheme. He was opposed to any revolutionary plan of change in the existing legislation; he was careful to point out that everything he had done was in faithful compliance with the law itself.

In that mood of high hope, of generous expectation, he went to Buffalo, and there, on the threshold of eternity, he delivered that memorable speech, worthy for its loftiness of tone, its blameless morality, its breadth of view, to be regarded as his testament to the nation. Through all his pride of country and his joy of its success

runs the note of solemn warning, as in Kipling's noble hymn, "Lest We Forget."

The next day sped the bolt of doom, and for a week after—in an agony of dread, broken by illusive glimpses of hope that our prayers might be answered—the nation waited for the end. Nothing in the glorious life we saw gradually waning was more admirable and exemplary than its close. The gentle humanity of his words when he saw his assailant in danger of summary vengeance, "Do not let them hurt him"; his chivalrous care that the news should be broken gently to his wife; the fine courtesy with which he apologized for the damage which his death would bring to the great Exhibition; and the heroic resignation of his final words, "It is God's way; His will, not ours, be done," were all the instinctive expressions of a nature so lofty and so pure that pride in its nobility at once softened and enhanced the nation's sense of loss. The Republic grieved over such a son,—but is proud for ever of having produced him. After all, in spite of its tragic ending, his life was extraordinarily happy. He had, all his days, troops of friends, the cheer of fame and fruitful labor; and he became at last,

> "On fortune's crowning slope,
> The pillar of a people's hope,
> The center of a world's desire."

McKINLEY

HIS LAST SPEECH[1]

(1901)

Born in 1843, died in 1901; served in the Civil War, reaching the rank of Major; Member of Congress from Ohio in 1877-91; defeated for Congress in 1890; elected Governor of Ohio in 1891, and again in 1893; elected President in 1896, and again in 1900.

I AM glad again to be in the city of Buffalo and exchange greetings with her people, to whose generous hospitality I am not a stranger, and with whose good will I have been repeatedly and signally honored. To-day I have additional satisfaction in meeting and giving welcome to the foreign representatives assembled here, whose presence and participation in this Exposition have contributed in so marked a degree to its interest and success. To the commissioners of the Dominion of Canada and the British Colonies, the French Colonies, the Republics of Mexico and of Central and South America, and the commissioners of Cuba and Porto Rico, who share with us in this undertaking, we give the hand of fellowship and felicitate with them upon the triumphs of art, science, education and manufacture which the old has bequeathed to the new century.

[1] Delivered in Buffalo at a reception at the World's Fair on September 5, 1901, the day before he was assassinated.

Expositions are the timekeepers of progress. They record the world's advancement. They stimulate the energy, enterprise and intellect of the people, and quicken human genius. They go into the home. They broaden and brighten the daily life of the people. They open mighty storehouses of information to the student. Every exposition, great or small, has helped to some onward step.

Comparison of ideas is always educational and, as such, instructs the brain and hand of man. Friendly rivalry follows, which is the spur to industrial improvement, the inspiration to useful invention and to high endeavor in all departments of human activity. It exacts a study of the wants, comforts, and even the whims of the people, and recognizes the efficacy of high quality and low prices to win their favor. The quest for trade is an incentive to men of business to devise, invent, improve and economize in the cost of production. Business life, whether among ourselves, or with other peoples, is ever a sharp struggle for success. It will be none the less in the future.

Without competition we would be clinging to the clumsy and antiquated process of farming and manufacture and the methods of business of long ago, and the twentieth would be no further advanced than the eighteenth century. But tho commercial competitors we are, commercial enemies we must not be. The Pan-American Exposition has done its work

thoroughly, presenting in its exhibits evidences of the highest skill and illustrating the progress of the human family in the Western Hemisphere. This portion of the earth has no cause for humiliation for the part it has performed in the march of civilization. It has not accomplished everything; far from it. It has simply done its best, and without vanity or boastfulness, and recognizing the manifold achievements of others it invites the friendly rivalry of all the powers in the peaceful pursuits of trade and commerce, and will cooperate with all in advancing the highest and best interests of humanity. The wisdom and energy of all the nations are none too great for the world work. The success of art, science, industry and invention is an international asset and a common glory.

After all, how near one to the other is every part of the world. Modern inventions have brought into close relation widely separated peoples and make them better acquainted. Geographic and political divisions will continue to exist, but distances have been effaced. Swift ships and fast trains are becoming cosmopolitan. They invade fields which a few years ago were impenetrable. The world's products are exchanged as never before and with increasing transportation facilities come increasing knowledge and larger trade. Prices are fixed with mathematical precision by supply and demand. The world's selling prices are regulated by market and crop reports. We travel greater

distances in a shorter space of time and with more ease than was ever dreamed of by the fathers. Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. The same important news is read, tho in different languages, the same day in all Christendom.

The telegraph keeps us advised of what is occurring everywhere, and the Press foreshadows, with more or less accuracy, the plans and purposes of the nations. Market prices of products and of securities are hourly known in every commercial mart, and the investments of the people extend beyond their own national boundaries into the remotest parts of the earth. Vast transactions are conducted and international exchanges are made by the tick of the cable. Every event of interest is immediately bulletined. The quick gathering and transmission of news, like rapid transit, are of recent origin, and are only made possible by the genius of the inventor and the courage of the investor. It took a special messenger of the goverment, with every facility known at the time for rapid travel, nineteen days to go from the City of Washington to New Orleans with a message to General Jackson that the war with England had ceased and a treaty of peace had been signed. How different now! We reach General Miles, in Porto Rico, and he was able through the military telegraph to stop his army on the firing line with the message that the United States and Spain had signed a protocol suspending hostilities. We knew almost

instanter of the first shots fired at Santiago, and the subsequent surrender of the Spanish forces was known at Washington within less than an hour of its consummation. The first ship of Cervera's fleet had hardly emerged from that historic harbor when the fact was flashed to our Capitol, and the swift destruction that followed was announced immediately through the wonderful medium of telegraphy.

So accustomed are we to safe and easy communication with distant lands that its temporary interruption, even in ordinary times, results in loss and inconvenience. We shall never forget the days of anxious waiting and suspense when no information was permitted to be sent from Pekin, and the diplomatic representatives of the nations in China, cut off from all communication, inside and outside of the walled capital, were surrounded by an angry and misguided mob that threatened their lives; nor the joy that thrilled the world when a single message from the government of the United States brought through our minister the first news of the safety of the besieged diplomats.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century there was not a mile of steam railroad on the globe; now there are enough miles to make its circuit many times. Then there was not a line of electric telegraph; now we have a vast mileage traversing all lands and seas. God and man have linked the nations together. No nation can longer be indifferent to any other. And as we

are brought more and more in touch with each other, the less occasion is there for misunderstandings, and the stronger the disposition, when we have differences, to adjust them in the court of arbitration, which is the noblest forum for the settlement of international disputes.

My fellow citizens, trade statistics indicate that this country is in a state of unexampled prosperity. The figures are almost appalling. They show that we are utilizing our fields and forests and mines, and that we are furnishing profitable employment to the millions of workingmen throughout the United States, bringing comfort and happiness to their homes, and making it possible to lay by savings for old age and disability. That all the people are participating in this great prosperity is seen in every American community and shown by the enormous and unprecedented deposits in our savings banks. Our duty in the care and security of these deposits and their safe investment demands the highest integrity and the best business capacity of those in charge of these depositories of the people's earnings.

We have a vast and intricate business, built up through years of toil and struggle in which every part of the country has its stake, which will not permit of either neglect or of undue selfishness. No narrow, sordid policy will subserve it. The greatest skill and wisdom on the part of manufacturers and producers will be required to hold and increase it. Our industrial

enterprises, which have grown to such great proportions, affect the homes and occupations of the people and the welfare of the country. Our capacity to produce has developed so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention. Only a broad and enlightened policy will keep what we have. No other policy will get more. In these times of marvelous business energy and gain we ought to be looking to the future, strengthening the weak places in our industrial and commercial systems, that we may be ready for any storm or strain.

By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade. We must not repose in the fancied security that we can for ever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established.

What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess

must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not. If, perchance, some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad? Then, too, we have inadequate steamship service. New lines of steamships have already been put in commission between the Pacific coast ports of the United States and those on the western coasts of Mexico and Central and South America. These should be followed up with direct steamship lines between the western coast of the United States and South American ports. One of the needs of the times is direct commercial lines from our vast fields of production to the fields of consumption that we have but barely touched. Next in advantage to having the thing to sell is to have the conveyance to carry it to the buyer. We must encourage our merchant marine. We must have more ships. They must be under the American flag; built and manned

and owned by Americans. These will not only be profitable in a commercial sense; they will be messengers of peace and amity wherever they go.

We must build the Isthmian canal, which will unite the two oceans and give a straight line of water communication with the western coasts of Central and South America and Mexico. The construction of a Pacific cable can not be longer postponed. In the furtherance of these objects of national interest and concern you are performing an important part. This Exposition would have touched the heart of that American statesman whose mind was ever alert and thought ever constant for a larger commerce and a truer fraternity of the republics of the New World. His broad American spirit is felt and manifested here. He needs no identification to an assemblage of Americans anywhere, for the name of Blaine is inseparably associated with the Pan-American movement which finds here practical and substantial expression, and which we all hope will be firmly advanced by the Pan-American Congress that assembles this autumn in the capital of Mexico. The good work will go on. It can not be stopped. Those buildings will disappear; this creation of art and beauty and industry will perish from sight, but their influence will remain to "make it live beyond its too short living with praises and thanksgiving." Who can tell the new thoughts that have been awakened, the ambitions fired and the high

achievements that will be wrought through this Exposition?

Gentlemen, let us ever remember that our interest is in concord, not conflict; and that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war. We hope that all who are represented here may be moved to higher and nobler efforts for their own and the world's good, and that out of this city may come not only greater commerce and trade for us all, but, more essential than these, relations of mutual respect, confidence and friendship which will deepen and endure. Our earnest prayer is that God will graciously vouchsafe prosperity, happiness and peace to all our neighbors, and like blessings to all the peoples and powers of earth.

ROOSEVELT

I

HIS INAUGURAL ADDRESS[1]

(1905)

Born in 1858; elected to the New York Assembly in 1882; defeated Candidate for Mayor of New York in 1886; National Civil Service Commissioner in 1889–95; President of the New York Police Board in 1895–97; Assistant Secretary of the Navy in 1897–98; organized the Rough Riders for the Spanish War, and became their Colonel in 1898; elected Governor of New York in 1899; elected Vice-President in 1900; succeeded to Presidency in 1901; elected President in 1904.

My Fellow Citizens:—No people on earth have more cause to be thankful than ours, and this is said reverently, in no spirit of boastfulness in our own strength, but with gratitude to the Giver of Good, Who has blessed us with the conditions which have enabled us to achieve so large a measure of well-being and happiness.

To us as a people it has been granted to lay the foundations of our national life in a new continent. We are the heirs of the ages, and yet we have had to pay few of the penalties which in old countries are exacted by the dead hand of a bygone civilization. We have not been obliged to fight for our existence against any alien race; and yet our life has called for the vigor and

[1] Delivered March 4, 1905.

effort without which the manlier and hardier virtues wither away.

Under such conditions it would be our own fault if we failed, and the success which we have had in the past, the success which we confidently believe the future will bring, should cause in us no feeling of vainglory, but rather a deep and abiding realization of all that life has offered us; a full acknowledgment of the responsibility which is ours; and a fixed determination to show that under a free government a mighty people can thrive best, alike as regard the things of the body and the things of the soul.

Much has been given to us, and much will rightfully be expected from us. We have duties to others and duties to ourselves—and we can shirk neither. We have become a great nation, forced by the fact of its greatness into relation to the other nations of the earth, and we must behave as beseems a people with such responsibilities.

Toward all other nations, large and small, our attitude must be one of cordial and sincere friendship. We must show not only in our words but in our deeds that we are earnestly desirous of securing their good will by acting toward them in a spirit of just and generous recognition of all their rights.

But justice and generosity in a nation, as in an individual, count most when shown not by the weak but by the strong. While ever careful to refrain from wronging others, we must be no

less insistent that we are not wronged ourselves. We wish peace; but we wish the peace of justice, the peace of righteousness. We wish it because we think it is right, and not because we are afraid. No weak nation that acts rightly and justly should ever have cause to fear, and no strong power should ever be able to single us out as a subject for insolent aggression.

Our relations with the other powers of the world are important; but still more important are our relations among ourselves. Such growth in wealth, in population, and in power, as a nation has seen during a century and a quarter of its national life, is inevitably accompanied by a like growth in the problems which are ever before every nation that rises to greatness. Power invariably means both responsibility and danger. Our forefathers faced certain perils which we have outgrown. We now face other perils the very existence of which it was impossible that they should foresee.

Modern life is both complex and intense, and the tremendous changes wrought by the extraordinary industrial development of the half century are felt in every fiber of our social and political being. Never before have men tried so vast and formidable an experiment as that of administering the affairs of a continent under the forms of a democratic republic. The conditions which have told for our marvelous material well-being, which have developed to a very high degree our energy, self-reliance, and individual

initiative, also have brought the care and anxiety inseparable from the accumulation of great wealth in industrial centers.

Upon the success of our experiment much depends—not only as regards our own welfare, but as regards the welfare of mankind. If we fail, the cause of free self-government throughout the world will rock to its foundations, and therefore our responsibility is heavy, to ourselves, to the world as it is to-day, and to the generations yet unborn.

There is no good reason why we should fear the future, but there is every reason why we should face it seriously, neither hiding from ourselves the gravity of the problems before us, nor fearing to approach these problems with the unbending, unflinching purpose to solve them aright.

Yet after all, tho the problems are new, tho the tasks set before us differ from the tasks set before our fathers, who founded and preserved this Republic, the spirit in which these tasks must be undertaken and these problems faced, if our duty is to be well done, remains essentially unchanged. We know that self-government is difficult. We know that no people needs such high traits of character as that people which seeks to govern its affairs aright through the freely expressed will of the free men who compose it.

But we have faith that we shall not prove false to memories of the men of the mighty past. They

did their work; they left us the splendid heritage we now enjoy. We in our turn have an assured confidence that we shall be able to leave this heritage unwasted and enlarged to our children's children.

To do so, we must show, not merely in great crises, but in the every-day affairs of life, the qualities of practical intelligence, of courage, of hardihood, and endurance, and, above all, the power of devotion to a lofty ideal, which made great the men who founded this Republic in the days of Washington; which made great the men who preserved this Republic in the days of Abraham Lincoln.

II

ON AMERICAN MOTHERHOOD[1]

(1905)

In our modern industrial civilization there are many and grave dangers to counterbalance the splendors and the triumphs. It is not a good thing to see cities grow at disproportionate speed relatively to the country; for the small land owners, the men who own their little homes, and therefore to a very large extent the men who till farms, the men of the soil, have hitherto made the foundation of lasting national life in every State;

[1] From his speech in Washington on March 13, 1905, before the National Congress of Mothers. Printed from a copy furnished by the president for this collection in response to a request.

and, if the foundation becomes either too weak or too narrow, the superstructure, no matter how attractive, is in imminent danger of falling.

But far more important than the question of the occupation of our citizens is the question of how their family life is conducted. No matter what that occupation may be, as long as there is a real home and as long as those who make up that home do their duty to one another, to their neighbors and to the State, it is of minor consequence whether the man's trade is plied in the country or in the city, whether it calls for the work of the hands or for the work of the head.

No piled-up wealth, no splendor of material growth, no brilliance of artistic development, will permanently avail any people unless its home life is healthy, unless the average man possesses honesty, courage, common sense, and decency, unless he works hard and is willing at need to fight hard; and unless the average woman is a good wife, a good mother, able and willing to perform the first and greatest duty of womanhood, able and willing to bear, and to bring up as they should be brought up, healthy children, sound in body, mind, and character, and numerous enough so that the race shall increase and not decrease.

There are certain old truths which will be true as long as this world endures, and which no amount of progress can alter. One of these is the truth that the primary duty of the husband is to be the home-maker, the breadwinner for

his wife and children, and that the primary duty of the woman is to be the helpmate, the housewife, and mother. The woman should have ample educational advantages; but save in exceptional cases the man must be, and she need not be, and generally ought not to be, trained for a lifelong career as the family breadwinner; and, therefore, after a certain point, the training of the two must normally be different because the duties of the two are normally different. This does not mean inequality of function, but it does mean that normally there must be dissimilarity of function. On the whole, I think the duty of the woman the more important, the more difficult, and the more honorable of the two; on the whole I respect the woman who does her duty even more than I respect the man who does his.

No ordinary work done by a man is either as hard or as responsible as the work of a woman who is bringing up a family of small children; for upon her time and strength demands are made not only every hour of the day but often every hour of the night. She may have to get up night after night to take care of a sick child, and yet must by day continue to do all her household duties as well; and if the family means are scant she must usually enjoy even her rare holidays taking her whole brood of children with her. The birth pangs make all men the debtors of all women. Above all our sympathy and regard are due to the struggling wives among those whom Abraham Lincoln called the plain people, and

whom he so loved and trusted; for the lives of these women are often led on the lonely heights of quiet, self-sacrificing heroism.

Just as the happiest and most honorable and most useful task that can be set any man is to earn enough for the support of his wife and family, for the bringing up and starting in life of his children, so the most important, the most honorable and desirable task which can be set any woman is to be a good and wise mother in a home marked by self-respect and mutual forbearance, by willingness to perform duty, and by refusal to sink into self-indulgence or avoid that which entails effort and self-sacrifice. Of course there are exceptional men and exceptional women who can do and ought to do much more than this, who can lead and ought to lead great careers of outside usefulness in addition to—not as substitutes for—their home work; but I am not speaking of exceptions; I am speaking of the primary duties, I am speaking of the average citizens, the average men and women who make up the nation.

Inasmuch as I am speaking to an assemblage of mothers, I shall have nothing whatever to say in praise of an easy life. Yours is the work which is never ended. No mother has an easy time, the most mothers have very hard times; and yet what true mother would barter her experience of joy and sorrow in exchange for a life of cold selfishness, which insists upon perpetual amusement and the avoidance of care, and which

often finds its fit dwelling place in some flat designed to furnish with the least possible expenditure of effort the maximum of comfort and of luxury, but in which there is literally no place for children?

The woman who is a good wife, a good mother, is entitled to our respect as is no one else; but she is entitled to it only because, and so long as, she is worthy of it. Effort and self-sacrifice are the law of worthy life for the man as for the woman; who neither the effort nor the self-sacrifice may be the same for the one as for the other. I do not in the least believe in the patient Griselda type of woman, in the woman who submits to gross and long continued ill treatment, any more than I believe in a man who tamely submits to wrongful aggression. No wrong-doing is so abhorrent as wrong-doing by a man toward the wife and the children who should arouse every tender feeling in his nature. Selfishness toward them, lack of tenderness toward them, lack of consideration for them, above all, brutality in any form toward them, should arouse the heartiest scorn and indignation in every upright soul.

I believe in the woman keeping her self-respect just as I believe in the man doing so. I believe in her rights just as much as I believe in the man's, and indeed a little more; and I regard marriage as a partnership, in which each partner is in honor bound to think of the rights of the other as well as of his or her own. But I think that the duties are even more important than the

rights; and in the long run I think that the reward is ampler and greater for duty well done, than for the insistence upon individual rights, necessary tho this, too, must often be. Your duty is hard, your responsibility great; but greatest of all is your reward. I do not pity you in the least. On the contrary, I feel respect and admiration for you.

Into the woman's keeping is committed the destiny of the generations to come after us. In bringing up your children you mothers must remember that while it is essential to be loving and tender it is no less essential to be wise and firm. Foolishness and affection must not be treated as interchangeable terms; and besides training your sons and daughters in the softer and milder virtues, you must seek to give them those stern and hardy qualities which in after life they will surely need. Some children will go wrong in spite of the best training; and some will go right even when their surroundings are most unfortunate; nevertheless an immense amount depends upon the family training. If you mothers through weakness bring up your sons to be selfish and to think only of themselves, you will be responsible for much sadness among the women who are to be their wives in the future. If you let your daughters grow up idle, perhaps under the mistaken impression that as you yourselves have had to work hard they shall know only enjoyment, you are preparing them to be useless to others and burdens to themselves. Teach boys

and girls alike that they are not to look forward to lives spent in avoiding difficulties, but to lives spent in overcoming difficulties. Teach them that work, for themselves and also for others, is not a curse but a blessing; seek to make them happy, to make them enjoy life, but seek also to make them face life with the steadfast resolution to wrest success from labor and adversity, and to do their whole duty before God and to man. Surely she who can thus train her sons and her daughters is thrice fortunate among women.

There are many good people who are denied the supreme blessing of children, and for these we have the respect and sympathy always due to those who, from no fault of their own, are denied any of the other great blessings of life. But the man or woman who deliberately foregoes these blessings, whether from viciousness, coldness, shallow-heartedness, self-indulgence, or mere failure to appreciate aright the difference between the all-important and the unimportant, —why, such a creature merits contempt as hearty as any visited upon the soldier who runs away in battle, or upon the man who refuses to work for the support of those dependent upon him, and who tho able-bodied is yet content to eat in idleness the bread which others provide.

The existence of women of this type forms one of the most unpleasant and unwholesome features of modern life. If any one is so dim of vision as to fail to see what a thoroughly unlovely creature such a woman is I wish they would read Judge

Robert Grant's novel "Unleavened Bread," ponder seriously the character of Selma, and think of the fate that would surely overcome any nation which developed its average and typical woman along such lines. Unfortunately it would be untrue to say that this type exists only in American novels. That it also exists in American life is made unpleasantly evident by the statistics as to the dwindling families in some localities. It is made evident in equally sinister fashion by the census statistics as to divorce, which are fairly appalling; for easy divorce is now as it ever has been, a bane to any nation, a curse to society, a menace to the home, an incitement to married unhappiness and to immorality, an evil thing for men and a still more hideous evil for women. These unpleasant tendencies in our American life are made evident by articles such as those which I actually read not long ago in a certain paper, where a clergyman was quoted, seemingly with approval, as expressing the general American attitude when he said that the ambition of any save a very rich man should be to rear two children only, so as to give his children an opportunity "to taste a few of the good things of life."

This man, whose profession and calling should have made him a moral teacher, actually set before others the ideal, not of training children to do their duty, not of sending them forth with stout hearts and ready minds to win triumphs for themselves and their country, not of allowing

them the opportunity, and giving them the privilege of making their own place in the world, but, forsooth, of keeping the number of children so limited that they might "taste a few good things!" The way to give a child a fair chance in life is not to bring it up in luxury, but to see that it has the kind of training that will give it strength of character. Even apart from the vital question of national life, and regarding only the individual interest of the children themselves, happiness in the true sense is a hundredfold more apt to come to any given member of a healthy family of healthy-minded children, well brought up, well educated, but taught that they must shift for themselves, must win their own way, and by their own exertions make their own positions of usefulness, than it is apt to come to those whose parents themselves have acted on and have trained their children to act on, the selfish and sordid theory that the whole end of life is to "taste a few good things."

The intelligence of the remark is on a par with its morality; for the most rudimentary mental process would have shown the speaker that if the average family in which there are children contained but two children the nation as a whole would decrease in population so rapidly that in two or three generations it would very deservedly be on the point of extinction, so that the people who had acted on this base and selfish doctrine would be giving place to others with braver and more robust ideals. Nor would such a result be in any way regrettable; for a race that prac-

tised such doctrine—that is, a race that practised race suicide—would thereby conclusively show that it was unfit to exist, and that it had better give place to people who had not forgotten the primary laws of their being.

To sum up, then, the whole matter is simple enough. If either a race or an individual prefers the pleasure of more effortless ease, of self-indulgence, to the infinitely deeper, the infinitely higher pleasures that come to those who know the toil and the weariness, but also the joy, of hard duty well done, why, that race or that individual must inevitably in the end pay the penalty of leading a life both vapid and ignoble. No man and no woman really worthy of the name can care for the life spent solely or chiefly in the avoidance of risk and trouble and labor. Save in exceptional cases the prizes worth having in life must be paid for, and the life worth living must be a life of work for a worthy end, and ordinarily of work more for others than for one's self.

The woman's task is not easy—no task worth doing is easy—but in doing it, and when she has done it, there shall come to her the highest and holiest joy known to mankind; and having done it, she shall have the reward prophesied in Scripture; for her husband and her children, yes, and all people who realize that her work lies at the foundation of all national happiness and greatness, shall rise up and call her blessed.

INDEX TO THE TEN VOLUMES

Abelard, Peter; biographical note on, vol. VII, 17; on the divine tragedy, 17–19.

Achilles; his reply to the envoys, vol. I, 3–8.

Adams, Samuel; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 110; on American independence, 110–122.

Æschines; biographical note on, vol. I, 186; his speech "on the crown," against Demosthenes, 186–232.

Agricola, Cnæus Julius; biographical note on, vol. II, 253; to his army in Scotland, 253–255.

Alcibiades; biographical note on, vol. I, 41; in support of the Athenian expedition to Sicily, 41–47; to the Spartans, 47–48.

Altgeld, John P.; biographical note on, vol. X, 208; on municipal and governmental ownership, 208–219.

Ames, Fisher; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 155; on the treaty with Great Britain, 155–165.

Anthony, Susan B.; biographical note on, vol. X, 58; on woman's right to the suffrage, 58–60.

Antony, Mark; biographical note on, vol. II, 200; his oration over the dead body of Cæsar, 200–215.

Apponyi, Albert, Count; biographical note on, vol. VII, 262, on the death of Louis Kossuth, 262–264.

Asquith, Henry; biographical note on, vol. V, 201; on trade and the empire, 201–210.

Augustine, Aurelius, Saint; biographical note on, vol. VII, 7; on the Lord's Prayer, 7–16.

Baker, Edward D.; biographical note on, vol. X, 3; his reply to Breckenridge, 3–8.

Balfour, Arthur James; biographical note on, vol. V, 161; on the benefits of reading, 161–173.

Bancroft, George; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 231; on the people in art, government and religion, 231–239.

Barère de Vieuzac, Bertrand; biographical note on, vol. VII, 161; on the heroism of the "Vengeur" sailors, 161–167.

Barnave, Antoine Pierre Joseph Marie; biographical note on, vol. VII, 112; against majority absolutism, 112–116.

Beaconsfield, Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of; biographical note on, vol. V, 38; on the principles of his party, 38–65.

Bede, surnamed "the Venerable"; biographical note on, vol. III, 3; his sermon on All Saints, 3–7.

INDEX

Beecher, Henry Ward; biographical note on, vol. X, 9; his speech in Liverpool, 9–26.

Benton, Thomas H.; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 240; on the expunging resolution, 240–252.

Bernard, Saint; biographical note on, vol. VII, 20; on another crusade, 20–22.

Birrell, Augustine; biographical note on, vol. V, 131; on the distinction of Burke, 131–144.

Bismarck, Otto, Prince von; biographical note on, vol. VII, 243; his Canossa speech, 243–248.

Black Hawk, Chief of the Sacs; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 22; his speech to General Street, 22–24.

Blaine, James G.; biographical note on, vol. X, 111; on the death of Garfield, 111–139.

Bland, Richard P.; biographical note on, vol. X, 165; on "the parting of the ways," 165–174.

Bossuet, Jacques Bénigne; biographical note on, vol. VII, 63; on the death of the great Condé, 63–66.

Bourdaloue, Louis; biographical note on, vol. VII, 67; on the passion of Christ, 67–73.

Bradlaugh, Charles; biographical note on, vol. V, 91; his plea at the bar of the House of Commons, 91–98.

Brant, Joseph; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 5; his speech to Lord George Germaine, 5–8.

Bright, John; biographical note on, vol. IV, 222; on the English foreign policy, 222–242; on the "Trent" affair, 243–260.

Brooks, Preston S.; biographical note on, vol IX, 174; in defense of his attack on Sumner, 174–176.

Brougham, Henry, Lord; biographical note on, vol. IV, 138; on emancipation for the negro, 138–149.

Brown, John; biographical note on, vol. IX, 186; his speech to the court at his trial, 186–188.

Bryant, William Cullen; biographical note on, vol. IX, 144; his welcome to Kossuth, 144–148.

Bryce, James; biographical note on, vol. V, 145; on the government of Ireland bill, 145–160.

Bunyan, John; biographical note on, vol. III, 149; on "the heavenly footman," 149–153.

Burke, Edmund; biographical note on, vol. VI, 3; on conciliation with America, 3–40; on principles in politics, 40–49; at the trial of Warren Hastings, 50–58.

Butt, Isaac; biographical note on, vol. VI, 188; at the bar of the House of Lords, 188–194.

Cæsar, Julius; biographical note on, vol. II, 222; his speech on the punishment of the Catiline conspirators, 222–229.

Calhoun, John C.; biographical note on, vol. IX, 104; on the expunging resolution, 104–108; on the Clay compromise measures, 108–122.

Calvin, John; biographical note on, vol. VII, 50; on suffering persecution, 50–60.

INDEX

Cambon, Joseph; biographical note on, vol. VII, 152; on the situation in France, 152–155.

Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry; biographical note on, vol. V, 226; on the policy of the Liberal party, 226–238; his "The Duma is dead, long live the Duma" speech, 239–246.

Canning, George; biographical note on, vol. IV, 115; on granting aid to Portugal, 115–125.

Carnot, Lizare Nicolas Marguerite; biographical note on, vol. VII, 179; against setting up an empire, 179–186.

Carlyle, Thomas; biographical note on, vol. V, 17; his address as Lord Rector of Edinburgh University, 17–33.

Castelar, Emilio; biographical note on, vol. VII, 255; plea for a republic in Spain, 255–261.

Catiline, Lucius Sergius; biographical note on, vol. II, 216; his exhortation to conspiracy, 216–218; to his army before his defeat in battle, 219–221.

Cato, Marcus Porcius, surnamed "the Censor"; biographical note on, vol. II, 14; in support of the Oppian law, 14–22.

Cato, Marcus Porcius, surnamed "Uticensis," or "the Younger"; biographical note on, vol. II, 230; on the punishment of the Catiline conspirators, 230–236.

Cavour, Camillo Benso, Count di; biographical note on, vol. VII, 232; on Rome as the capital of United Italy, 232–236.

Chalmers, Thomas; biographical note on, vol. IV, 112; sermon on "When all things pass away," 112–114.

Chamberlain, Joseph; biographical note on, vol. V, 184; on the true conception of empire, 184–191.

Chatham, William Pitt, Earl of; biographical note on, vol. III, 193; his retort to the elder Horace Walpole, 193–197; on the right to tax America, 197–211; on affairs in America, 211–229.

Chesterfield, Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of; biographical note on, vol. III, 165; against the gin bill of the ministry, 165–172.

Choate, Rufus; biographical note on, vol. IX, 149; his eulogy of Webster, 149–159.

Chrysostom, John, Saint; biographical note on, vol. VII, 3; on the blessings of death, 3–6.

Churchill, Lord Randolph; biographical note on, vol. V, 99; his "Trust the people" speech, 99–108.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius; biographical note on, vol. II, 51; his first oration against Verres, 51–71; in opposition to a new agrarian law, 71–93; his first oration against Catiline, 93–113; his second oration against Catiline, 113–130; in behalf of Archias, the poet, 131–148; his first oration against Mark Antony, 148–169; his second oration against Mark Antony, 169–199.

INDEX

Clay, Henry; biographical note on, vol. IX, 76; on the emancipation of South America, 76–86; his attack on Jackson, 87–94; on his own compromise measures, 95–103.

Clemenceau, Eugène; biographical note on, vol. VII, 214; in the debate on socialism with Jaurès, 214–222.

Cleon; biographical note on, vol. I, 34; on the punishment of the Mytilæneans, 34–40.

Cleveland, Grover; biographical note on, vol. X, 130; his first inaugural address, 130–137; his eulogy on McKinley, 137–140.

Cobden, Richard; biographical note on, vol. IV, 156; on the effects of protection on agriculture, 156–179.

Conkling, Roscoe; biographical note on, vol. X, 94; his speech nominating Grant for third term, 94–98.

Corwin, Thomas; biographical note on, vol. IX, 123; on the Mexican war, 123–136.

Cranmer, Thomas; biographical note on, vol. III, 18; on his execution, 18–22.

Crisp, Charles F.; biographical note on, vol. X, 186; speech in closing the Wilson tariff bill debate, 186–197.

Cromwell, Oliver; biographical note on, vol. III, 117; at the opening of the first parliament under the Protectorate, 117–136.

Curran, John P.; biographical note on, vol. VI, 99; in behalf of Rowan and free speech, 99–127; on the prosecution of Justice Johnson for libel, 127–131.

Curtis, George William; biographical note on, vol. X, 65; his oration on Concord, 65–76.

Danton, Georges Jacques; biographical note on, vol. VII, 130; his "Dare, dare, always dare," speech, 130–131; on liberty of worship, 132–133; on taxing the rich, 134–135.

Davis, Jefferson; biographical note on, vol. IX, 203; on withdrawing from the Union, 203–210.

Davitt, Michael; biographical note on, vol. VI, 244; on the Irish Land League, 244–251.

Demosthenes; biographical note on, vol. I, 110; his second oration against Philip, 110–120; on the state of the Chersonesus, 120–142; "on the crown," 143–185.

Desmoulins, Benoît Camille; biographical note on, vol. VII, 89; the "Better to die than not live free" speech, 89–92.

D'Estournelles de Constant, Baron; biographical note on, vol. VII, 200; on France and the United States, 200–207.

Dickens, Charles; biographical note on, vol. IV, 150; as the literary guest of America, 150–155.

Dillon, John; biographical note on, vol. VI, 252; on the death of Gladstone, 252–254.

Dinarchus; biographical note on, vol. I, 233; his speech against Demosthenes, 233–242.

Douglas, Stephen A.; biographical note on, vol. IX, 259; in the first debate with Lincoln, 259–272.

INDEX

Eliot, Sir John; biographical note on, vol. III, 39; on the condition of England, 39–49.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 253; on the American scholar, 253–268.

Emmet, Robert; biographical note on, vol, VI, 137; on being found guilty of treason, 137–148.

Erskine, Thomas, Baron; biographical note on, vol. IV, 71; on limitations to freedom of speech, 71–83.

Everett, Edward; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 196; on the issues in the revolution, 196–203.

Fénelon, François; biographical note on, vol. VII, 74; on true and false simplicity, 74–79.

Fox, Charles James; biographical note on, vol. IV, 29; on the British defeat in America, 29–31; on the tyranny of the East India Company, 32–34; on the foreign policy of Washington, 35–37; on the refusal to negotiate with France, 37–59.

Franklin, Benjamin; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 37; his examination before the House of Commons, 37–52; on the federal constitution, 53–55; on the dangers of a salaried bureaucracy, 56–61.

Frederick the Great; biographical note on, vol. VII, 239; to his generals before invading Silesia, 239–240; to his generals before the battle of Leuthen, 241–242.

Gambetta, Léon; biographical note on, vol. VII, 196; on education for the peasantry in France, 196–199.

Garfield, James A.; biographical note on, vol. X, 99; his speech nominating Sherman for president, 99–106.

Garibaldi, Giuseppe; biographical note on, vol. VII, 229; to his soldiers, 229–231.

Garrison, William Lloyd; biographical note on, vol. IX, 189; on the death of John Brown, 189–191.

Germanicus, Cæsar; biographical note on, vol. II, 237; to his mutinous troops, 237–239; to his friends when dying, 240–241.

Gladstone, William Ewart; biographical note on, vol. V, 66; on the domestic and foreign relations of England, 66–90.

Gracchus, Caius; biographical note on, vol. II, 35; fragments by, 35–36.

Gracchus, Tiberius; biographical note on, vol. II, 31; fragments by, 31–34.

Grady, Henry W.; biographical note on, vol. X, 141; his speech on "the old South and the new," 141–154.

Grant, Ulysses S.; biographical note on, vol. X, 107; on reasons for being a republican, 107–110.

Grattan, Henry; biographical note on, vol. VI, 59; a plea for Irish legislative independence, 59–71; invective against Corry, 71–76.

Greeley, Horace; biographical note on, vol. X, 54; a speech during his campaign for president, 54–57.

INDEX

Hamilton, Alexander; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 132; on the adoption of the federal constitution, 132–142.

Hannibal; biographical note on, vol, II, 9; an address to his soldiers, 9–13.

Harrison, Benjamin; biographical note on, vol. X, 155; his inaugural address, 155–161.

Hay, John; biographical note on, vol. X, 228; his tribute to McKinley, 228–238.

Hayne, Robert Young; biographical note on, vol. IX, 3; on the Foote resolution, in reply to Webster, 3–23.

Henry, Patrick; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 62; the "Give me liberty or give me death" speech, 62–67; the "Shall liberty or empire be sought" speech, 67–76.

Hermocrates; biographical note on, vol. I, 55; on the union of Sicily against invaders, 55–60.

Hoar, George F.; biographical note on, vol. X, 220; on subjugation of the Philippines being iniquitous, 220–227.

Homer; biographical note on, vol. I, 3; the reply of Achilles to the envoys, 3–8.

Hugo, Victor; biographical note on, vol. VII, 193; in defense of his son, 193–195.

Ingersoll, Robert G.; biographical note on, vol. X, 77; his speech nominating Blaine for president, 77–81; at his brother's grave, 81–83.

Isæus; biographical note on, vol. I, 101; in the suit against Dicæogenes and Leochares, 101–109.

Isocrates; biographical note on, vol. I, 89; on the union of Greece to resist Persia, 89–100.

Jackson, Andrew; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 204; his second inaugural address, 204–209; his farewell address, 209–217.

Jaurès; biographical note on, vol. VII, 208; in the debate on socialism with Clemenceau, 208–213.

Jefferson, Thomas; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 166; his first inaugural address, 166–173.

Knox, John; biographical note on, vol. III, 23; on the first temptation of Christ, 23–33.

Kossuth, Louis; biographical note on, vol. VII, 249; on his welcome to New York, 249–254.

Lamar, L. Q. C.; biographical note on, vol. X, 61; on Sumner in the South, 61–64.

Lamartine, Alphonse Marie Louis; biographical note on, vol. VII, 187; to a deputation of Poles, 187–192.

Latimer, Hugh; biographical note on, vol. III, 11; his second sermon on "the card," 11–17.

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid; biographical note on, vol. V, 192; on the death of Queen Victoria, 192–200.

Lincoln, Abraham; biographical note on, vol. IX, 222; the "House divided against itself" speech, 222–227; in the first debate with Douglas, 227–237; his farewell words in Springfield, 238–239; his first inaugural address, 240–253; his

speech at Gettysburg, 254–255; his second inaugural address, 255–258.

Logan, the Indian Chief; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 3; his speech to Lord Dunmore, 3–4.

Loreburn, Robert Reid, Lord; biographical note on, vol. V, 247; on the policy of the English Liberals, 247–254.

Luther, Martin; biographical note on, vol. VII, 38; before the Diet of Worms, 38–43.

Lysias; biographical note on, vol. I, 61; against Eratosthenes, 61–64.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington, Lord; biographical note on, vol. IV, 126; on the reform bill, 126–137.

MacDonald, Sir John A.; biographical note on, vol. V, 3; on Canadian confederation, 3–16.

Mackintosh, Sir James; biographical note on, vol. IV, 84; a plea for free speech, 84–111.

Mansfield, William Murray, Earl of; biographical note on, vol. III, 230; on the right to tax America, 230–242.

Marat, Jean Paul; biographical note on, vol. VII, 148; in his own defense, 148–151.

Marius, Caius; biographical note on, vol. II, 43; on being accused of a low origin, 43–50.

Marshall, John; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 143; on the federal constitution, 143–154.

Massillon, Jean Baptiste; biographical note on, vol. VII, 80; on a malignant tongue, 80–88.

Mazzini, Giuseppe; biographical note on, vol. VII, 225; to the young men of Italy, 225–228.

McKinley, William; biographical note on, vol. X, 239; his last speech, 239–248.

Meagher, Thomas F.; biographical note on, vol. VI, 209; on abhorring the sword, 209–216.

Melanchthon, Philip; biographical note on, vol. VII, 44; on the death of Luther, 44–49.

Memmius, Caius; biographical note on, vol. II, 37; on a corrupt oligarchy, 37–42.

Milton, John; biographical note on, vol. III, 79; a plea for the liberty of unlicensed printing, 79–116.

Mirabeau, Gabriel Honoré Riquetti, Count de; biographical note on, vol. VII, 93; on Necker's financial plan, 93–96; on being accused of treasonable relations to the court, 97–111.

Moody, Dwight L.; biographical note on, vol. X, 84; his "What think ye of Christ" sermon, 84–93.

Morley, John; biographical note on, vol. V, 211; his address at Pittsburg, 211–225.

Napoleon I, Emperor; biographical note on, vol. VII, 168; to the army in Italy, 168–169; to the army in Italy again, 169–171; to the Directory, 172–173; during the Egyptian campaign, 173–175; on the anniversary of Austerlitz, 175–176; to his soldiers at Fontainebleau, 176–177; after the return from Elba, 177–178.

Newman, John Henry, Cardinal; biographical note on, vol. IV, 216; on Catholicism and the religions of the world, 216–221.

Nicias; biographical note on, vol. I, 49; against the Sicilian expedition, 49–54.

Nott, Eliphalet; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 174; on the death of Hamilton, 174–185.

O'Connell, Daniel; biographical note on, vol. VI, 195; in favor of the repeal of the Union, 195–208.

Otho, Marcus Salvius, Emperor; biographical note on, vol. II, 245; on becoming emperor, 245–247; to his soldiers in Rome, 248–251; to his soldiers before committing suicide, 251–252.

Otis, James; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 27; in opposition to writs of assistance, 27–36.

Palmerston, Henry John Temple, Viscount; biographical note on, vol. IV, 191; on affairs in Greece, 191–200.

Parnell, Charles Stewart; biographical note on, vol. VI, 224; on the forged letter printed in the London "Times," 224–230; on the home rule bill, 230–243.

Peel, Sir Robert; biographical note on, vol. IV, 180; on the repeal of the corn laws, 180–190.

Pericles; biographical note on, vol. I, 9; in favor of the Peloponnesian war, 9–16; on those who died in the war, 16–27; in defense of himself, 27–33.

Phillips, Charles; biographical note on, vol. VI, 149; an address to Catholics, 149–156; on the character of Napoleon, 157–161.

Phillips, Wendell; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 222; on the murder of Lovejoy, 222–230.

Pinkney, William; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 123; his speech on the relief of slaves, 123–131.

Pitt, William, the Younger; biographical note on, vol. IV, 3; on the war in America, 3–4; on the motion to force his resignation, 5–6; on the refusal to negotiate with France, 7–28.

Plunket, William Conyngham, Baron; biographical note on, vol. VI, 162; on Catholic relief, 162–172.

Prentiss, Sargent S.; on the death of Lafayette, 218–221.

Pushmataha, the Choctaw Chief; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 19; his speech to John C. Calhoun, 19–21.

Pym, John; biographical note on, vol. III, 50; on grievances in the reign of Charles I, 50–67.

Raleigh, Sir Walter; biographical note on, vol. III, 34; his last words on the scaffold, 34–38.

Randolph, John; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 186; on offensive war with England, 186–195.

INDEX

Red Jacket; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 9; his speech on the religion of the white man and the red, 9–13.

Redmond, John E.; biographical note on, vol. VI, 255; on Ireland and the coronation, 255–264.

Reed, Thomas B.; biographical note on, vol. X, 175; his speech in closing the Wilson tariff bill debate, 175–186.

Robespierre, Maximilien Marie Isidore; biographical note on, vol. VII, 136; against granting the king a trial, 136–144; his last speech, 144–147.

Roosevelt, Theodore; biographical note on, vol. X, 249; his inaugural address, 249–253; his address on American motherhood, 253–262.

Rosebery, Archibald Philip Primrose, Earl of; biographical note on, vol. V, 174; on Robert Burns, 174–183.

Rumbold, Richard; biographical note on, vol. III, 146; on the scaffold, 146–148.

Saint-Just, Antoine; biographical note on, vol. VII, 156; invective against Danton, 156–160.

Salisbury, Robert Cecil, Marquis of; biographical note on, vol. V, 109; on the desertion of Gordon in Egypt, 109–118.

Savonarola, Girolamo; biographical note on, vol. VII, 25; his report on his embassy to the king, 25–27; remarks after his excommunication, 28–29.

Schurz, Carl; biographical note on, vol. X, 27; his plea for general amnesty, 27–53.

Scipio, Publius Cornelius, the Eldest; biographical note on, vol. II, 3; to his army before battle, 3–8.

Scipio, Publius Cornelius, Africanus Major; biographical note on, vol. II, 23; to his mutinous troops, 23–30.

Seneca, Lucius Annæus; biographical note on, vol. II, 242; to Nero when in disfavor, 242–244.

Seward, William H.; biographical note on, vol. IX, 177; his "irrepressible conflict" speech, 177–185.

Sheil, Richard Lalor; biographical note on, vol. VI, 173; on the Irish as aliens, 173–176; on the disabilities of the Jews, 177–187.

Sheridan, Richard Brinsley; biographical note on, vol. VI, 77; at the trial of Warren Hastings, 77–98.

Sherman, John; biographical note on, vol. X, 198; his speech on "the crime of 1873," 198–207.

Sidney, Algernon; biographical note on, vol. III, 142; on the scaffold, 142–145.

Smith, Goldwin; biographical note on, vol. V, 34; on the secret beyond science, 34–37.

Socrates; biographical note on, vol. I, 65; in his own defense, 65–77; on being declared guilty, 77–81; on being condemned to death, 82–88.

Spurgeon, Charles H.; biographical note on, vol. V, 119; on man made rich by the poverty of Christ, 119–130.

Stephens, Alexander H.; biographical note on, vol. IX, 137; on the South and the public domain, 137–143.

Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of; biographical note on, vol. III, 68; in his own defense, 68–78.

Sullivan, A. M.; biographical note on, vol. VI, 217; on the Zulu war, 217–223.

Sumner, Charles; biographical note on, vol. IX, 160; on "The crime against Kansas," 160–173.

Tecumseh, the Shawnee Chief; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 14; to Governor Harrison at Vincennes, 14–16; to General Proctor, 16–18.

Thackeray, William Makepeace; biographical note on, vol. IV, 201; on charity and humor, 201–215.

Tone, Theobald Wolfe; biographical note on, vol. VI, 132; on being found guilty, 132–136.

Toombs, Robert; biographical note on, vol. IX, 211; on resigning from the Senate, 211–221.

Vane, Sir Harry, "the Younger"; biographical note on, vol. III, 137; against Richard Cromwell, 137–139; at his trial for high treason. 139–141.

Vergniaud, Pierre Victurien; biographical note on, vol. VII, 117; on the situation in France, 117–129.

Walpole, Sir Robert; biographical note on, vol. III, 154; on his proposed removal from office, 154–164.

Washington, George; biographical note on, vol. VIII, 77; on his appointment as commander-in-chief, 77–78; his first inaugural address, 79–85; his farewell address, 85–109.

Webster, Daniel; biographical note on, vol. IX, 24; his first Bunker Hill monument oration, 24–37; his reply to Hayne, 38–63; on the Clay compromise, otherwise known as "The seventh of March speech," 64–75.

Wesley, John; biographical note on, vol. III, 173; on God's love to fallen man, 173–180.

Whitefield, George; biographical note on, vol. III, 181; his sermon on the method of grace, 181–190.

Wilberforce, William; biographical note on, vol. IV, 60; on the horrors of the slave trade, 60–70.

Wilkes, John; biographical note on, vol. III, 243; on coercive measures in America, 243–248.

Willard, Frances E.; biographical note on, vol. X, 162; on work done for humanity, 162–164.

Wilson, Peter, the Cayuga Chief; his speech on the empire state, 25–26.

Wolfe, Gen. James; biographical note on, vol. III, 191; to his army before the battle of Quebec, 191–192.

Wyclif, John; biographical note on, vol. III, 8; on rules for decent living, 8–10.

Yancey, William Lowndes; biographical note on, vol. IX, 192; his speech of protest in the Charleston convention, 192–202.

Zwingli, Ulrich; biographical note on, vol. VII, 30; on mercenary soldiers, 30–37.